Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
Affaires indiennes et du Nord Canada

Northern Affairs Program

THE DIAND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT MONITORING PROGRAM: ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED STATISTICAL DATA FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Report No. 6-84

Prepared for:

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT
Les Terrasses de la Chaudiére
Ottawa. K1A 0H4

Debra Brown
Department of Geography
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, S7N 0W0
October, 1984

PREFACE

The Norman Wells Oilfield Expansion and Pipeline Project is the first major hydrocarbon development in the North. As such, it offers unique opportunities to observe at first hand the effects of a development project on the environment, the economy and the social fabric of the region. There have been a number of extensive public review processes dealing with major development project proposals, e.g., the Berger Inquiry, and the Environmental Assessment Review Panel (EARP) on the Norman Wells Project itself, which have debated extensively the possible effects of such projects. There have, however, been relatively few opportunities to observe the effects at the time the project is in the construction phase, the time of most likely disruption in a region.

Accordingly, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development mounted a monitoring program with the objective of identifying the impacts, negative and positive, of the Norman Wells Project as development proceeded. The four Mackenzie Valley communities closest to the project are Norman Wells itself, Fort Norman, Fort Simpson and Wrigley. Against the background of a database survey carried out in 1982 intended to provide the picture "before" the start of major construction, the DIAND Norman Wells Socio-Economic Impact Monitoring Program has developed a comprehensive battery of data on certain selected economic and social factors through the conduct of annual field surveys.

This program is, we believe, the first impact monitoring program of its kind, covering as it does the community situations "before", "during" and "after" project construction. The program is under the direction of Professor R.M. Bone of the University of Saskatchewan. Results are being presented in a series of technical reports pertaining to each year for which the survey has been carried out. The present report is designed to provide a comprehensive picture of the program findings from 1982 through 1984. A full list of published reports is presented in the Bibliography.

John Sacher
Director General
Northern Policy and
Coordination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. RENEWABLE RESOURCES AND NATIVE PEOPLES 3

2.1 Contact Person 4

2.2 Data Collection 4

2.3 Data Inventory 5

2.3.1 Number and value of pelts 5

2.3.2 Trapper income ranges 7

2.3.3 Number of General Hunting Licence holders 10

2.4 Reports Available 13

2.5 Assessment and Analysis 14

2.5.1 Northwest Territories 14

2.5.2 Inuvik and Fort Smith Regions 15

2.5.3 Norman Wells 15

2.5.4 Fort Norman 18

2.5.5 Fort Simpson and Wrigley 18

2.5.6 Another View 21

2.6 Future Development 26

2.7 Summary and Conclusions 29

3. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE 31

3.1 Contact Person 31

3.2 Data Collection 31

3.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation 34

3.3.1 Minister's Report 34

3.3.2 Social Assistance Need Amount Report 37

3.3.3 Social Assistance Earnings Report 38

3.3.4 Ad-Hoc Reports 41

3.4 Assessment and Analysis 42

3.4.1 The Indicators 42

3.4.2 Hypotheses 49

3.4.3 Northwest Territories 49

3.4.4 Inuvik South and Fort Simpson Areas 50

3.4.5 Fort Simpson 50

3.4.6 Wrigley 51

3.4.7 Fort Norman 52

3.4.8 Norman Wells 52

3.5 Summary and Conclusions 54

4. CHILD WELFARE 56

4.1 Contact Person 57

4.2 Data Collection 57

4.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation 59

4.3.1 Number of Days and Cases in Care 59

4.3.2 Reason for Admission 62

4.3.3 Legal Status 64

4.3.4 Cross Tabulation of Cases 64

4.3.5 Data Forms Which List Child Welfare Cases 65

4.4 Assessment and Analysis 66

4.4.1 Northwest Territories 66

4.4.2 Fort Simpson and Fort Smith Regions 67

4.4.3 Fort Simpson and Wrigley 67

4.4.4 Norman Wells and Fort Norman 76

4.5 Youth Camp Program 76

4.6 Summary and Conclusions 76

5. SERVICES TO THE AGED 71

5.1 Contact Persons 71

5.2 Data Collection 72

5.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation 72

5.3.1 Senior Citizens Supplementary Benefits 72

5.4 Northern Communities and the Aged 73

5.5 Summary and Conclusions 73

6. ALCOHOL ABUSE AND RELATED SOCIAL PROBLEMS 75

6.1 Contact Person 76

6.2 Data Collection 76

6.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation 83

6.3.1 Sentenced Inmates by Age Group Calendar Year and Supervising Area 83

6.3.2 Sentenced Inmates by Major Offence Grouping, Supervising Areas, Calendar Year 85

6.3.3 Special Report on Territorial Correctional Centers by Specified Report Period 85

6.3.4 Special Report on Territorial Correctional Centers' Admissions and Closures 88

6.3.5 Special Report on Probation and Parole 89

6.3.6 Probation Length Study 90

6.4 Assessment and Analyses 91

6.4.1 Northwest Territories 92

6.4.2 Fort Simpson and Inuvik South Areas 93

6.5 Summary and Conclusion 95

7. SUICIDES 97

7.1 Contact Person 97

7.2 Data Inventory and Evaluation 97

7.2.1 Number of Suicides 97

7.3 Assessment and Analysis 98

7.4 Northern Perspectives 98

7.5 Summary and Conclusion 98

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Number and Value of Pelts by Species, Fort Simpson, 1957/58 and 1982/83	6
Table 2.2	Distribution of Trappers' Income for Fort Simpson, 1973/74 and 1982/83	8
Table 2.3	Number of General Hunting Licenses by Community as of August 31, 1983	11
Table 2.4	Northwest Territories Fur Sales and Number of Trappers	16
Table 2.5	Fur Sales and Number of Trappers, Fort Smith and Inuvik Regions	17
Table 2.6	Trappers and Fur Sales at Norman Wells	19
Table 2.7	Trappers and Fur Sales at Fort Norman	19
Table 2.8	Trappers and Fur Sales at Fort Simpson and Wrigley	20
Table 2.9	Active Trappers as a Percentage of Community Native Populations	22
Table 2.10	Percentage of Trapper and GHL Holders by Native Population in Community	23
Table 2.11	Trapping Income as a Percentage of Community Income	24
Table 2.12	Indices of Average Pelt Price and Fur Sales in the Fort Smith and Inuvik Regions	27
Table 2.13	Overview of Limitations of Data Collected	30
Table 3.1	Social Assistance Application Form	32
Table 3.2	Minister's Report for Fort Simpson, 1982	36
Table 3.3	Social Assistance Needs Report for Fort Simpson for 1980/81	39

Table 3.4	Social Assistance Earnings Report for Fort Simpson, 1980/81	40
Table 3.5	Social Assistance Case Months by Economic Reasons	43
Table 3.6	Social Assistance Expenditures for Economic Reasons	44
Table 3.7	Social Assistance Case-Months for Reason of Dependent Children	45
Table 3.8	Social Assistance Expenditures for Reason of Dependent Children	46
Table 3.9	Total Social Assistance Case-Months	47
Table 3.10	Total Social Assistance Expenditures	48
Table 3.11	Persons Receiving Social Assistance as a Percentage of Community Population	53
Table 3.12	Limitations of Social Assistance Data	55
Table 4.1	Child Welfare Application Form	58
Table 4.2	Child Welfare by Days and Cases in Care for Communities in the Fort Smith Region in August 1982	60
Table 4.3	Reasons for Admission by Admission Age Groups, Fort Simpson, May 31, 1982: Number of Cases in Each Group	63
Table 4.4	Ranked Reasons for Admission to Child Welfare (Fort Simpson Area, May 31, 1982)	68
Table 4.5	Overview of Chief Limitations of the Data Considered	70
Table 5.1	Data Limitation	74
Table 6.1	Total Volume of Liquor Sold in the NWT	77
Table 6.2	Value of Liquor Sales	78
Table 6.3	Correctional Intake Form	79

Table 6.4 Correctional Closure Form 80

Table 6.5 Probation Intake Form 81

Table 6.6 Probation Closure Form 82

Table 6.7 Corrections Information System—Sentenced Intakes by Year and Age (Fort Simpson Area, 1967) 84

Table 6.8 Corrections Information System—Sentenced Intakes by Year and Age (Fort Simpson Area, 1975) 86

Table 6.9 Number of Persons Receiving a Jail Sentence 94

Table 6.10 Chief Limitations of the Data Discussed 96

Table 7.1 Suicides in the Northwest Territories 99

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this study is to assess the value of administrative records for research purposes associated with the socio-economic monitoring of the Norman Wells Project. The chief value of administrative records for a monitoring study is its capacity to present a longitudinal view of change over time. As administrative or program statistics were not collected for the purpose of monitoring socio-economic change over time, minor inconsistencies in the collection of data and/or aggregation of data by communities or regions may generate significant variations for use in a research project. While this report focuses on the limitations of administrative data, these administrative records often provide the only information on sensitive community issues. These data can be used with much more assurance at the regional and territorial levels.

The government gathered statistics discussed in this report are available for varying periods of time. Most cover the years 1974 to 1982. This information may allow the establishment of long-term trends prior to commencement of the Norman Wells Project. Any significant deviation from these trends during the construction period would suggest that the Norman Wells construction activity has had an impact. Since construction work began at Norman Wells in early 1982, major socio-economic changes should be reflected in the GNWT figures for the fiscal year 1982/83 (some GNWT figures are organized by the calendar). For Fort Norman, Wrigley and Fort Simpson, these changes would first be

detected in the 1982/83 figures or the 1983 calendar year figures because pipeline construction began with right-of-way clearing in early 1983. However, it must be remembered that construction of the Norman Wells Project is but one factor in a complex socio-economic environment. For example, some petroleum exploration was conducted by other companies during the construction period of the Norman Wells Project.

Interviews with GNWT officials and data collection from these agencies were conducted in May and June 1984 at Yellowknife by Debra Brown. Approval of this summer program was obtained from the office of the GNWT Norman Wells Co-ordinator (Darryl Bohnet). The main departments involved were Social Services (Sheldon Nider) and Renewable Resources (Rupert Tinling). The project was funded by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

2. RENEWABLE RESOURCES AND NATIVE PEOPLES

The Berger report stressed that the land is the foundation of native sense of identity, s lf respect and security.[1] Native leaders consider renewable resources to be the economic and social cornerstone of northern communities. Modern development, ranging from industrial projects to the creation of community infrastructure, has affected the traditional native economy, raising concerns about the future well-being of northern ecology and the land-based economy. For this reason, administrative data on renewable resources is presented and evaluated in terms of a suitable and reliable source of information on trapping and hunting. This review takes place with the knowledge that the Berger report found that statistical records for the early 1970s were ". . . incomplete, inadequate and sometimes confusing."[2] Since then, the GNWT Renewable Resources have made a number of changes in their method of data collection. For example, they no longer rely on Fur Export Tax returns for estimating fur production.[3]

---

[1]Thomas R. Berger. 1977. Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland: The Report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry: Volume 1. Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, pp. 88, 95.

[2]Berger, Volume II, p. 8.

[3]Berger, Volume II, p. 10; see chapter 2 (Renewable Resources) but particularly pp. 8-35 for a full discussion by Berger on inadequacies of GNWT data. He also discusses output and trends in the traditional economy.

2.1 Contact Person

Rupert Tinling

Supervisor
Resource Development Field Services
GNWT Department of Renewable Resources
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

(403) 873-7758

2.2 Data Collection

Local wildlife officers keep records of the number and value of pelts trappers have sold and from these records the number of trappers is determined. Trappers may use the territorial Fur Marketing Service to sell pelts. These pelts are brought to the local wildlife officer who inspects them and establishes an appraised value. An advance of up to 75 percent of the appraised value can be negotiated by the trapper. Payment of this advance is made by cheque. The fur is left with the wildlife officer who promptly sends it to the auction chosen by the trapper. When the fur is sold, the auction reimburses the GNWT for any advance made and sends the balance of the money along with the transaction statements to the trapper via the wildlife officer.

These transaction statements are used by Renewable Resources to determine the total number and value of pelts sold. At the end of the licence year, regional offices collect the fur sale data and send it to Yellowknife.

Unfortunately the collection of fur sales statistics by communities has some irregularities. For example, some of the small

communities are sometimes included with larger communities (e.g., Jean Marie River and Nahanni Butte were included in the income and active trapper figures for Fort Simpson in 1973/74, 1974/75 and 1975/76). These changes in the spatial (community) units of statistics posed a limitation in interpreting the data over time for the communities concerned.

General Hunting Licences (GHL's) allow a person to hunt and trap and this licence must be validated each year by a local wildlife officer. This makes possible the determination of the number of the GHL holders in a community.

2.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation

2.3.1 Number and value of pelts by species, community and licence year (July 1 to June 30)

An example of these statistics for a community (Fort Simpson) are found in Table 2.1. Data for licence years 1957/58 to 1982/83 are currently available. The 1983/84 figures are expected to be available in September 1984.

Until the mid 1970's, the number and value of pelts by species and community was tabulated annually from Fur Export Tax returns by the Department of Renewable Resources in Yellowknife. Since then, the Department of Renewable Resources has utilized records of sales to fur dealers and others in the process described in Section 2.2 "Data Collection".

Evaluation. Fur Export Tax returns recorded raw pelts exported from the NWT. These annual figures do not necessarily occur in the

Table 2.1

Number and Value of Pelts by Species
Fort Simpson, 1957/58 and 1982/83*

Date (Licence Year)	Bear				Beaver		Fox							
	Polar		Other				Blue		Cross		Red		Silver	
	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$
1957/58*	—	—	3	7.80	2,151	19,186.92	—	—	2	6.00	5	8.05	—	—
1982/83	—	—	2	315.00	186	3,583.50	—	—	8	743.00	7	451.00	—	—

Date (Licence Year)	Lynx		Fisher		Marten		Mink		Muskrat		Otter	
	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$
1957/58	255	1,756.95	1	19.50	657	4,408.47	114	2,259.48	7,013	3,366.24	16	316.64
1982/83	184	56,200.00	—	—	1,780	82,080.00	61	1,934.00	76	201.45	—	—

Date (Licence Year)	Squirrel		Weasel		Wolf		Wolverine		Seal		Total
	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	$
1957/58	7,890	244.90	442	313.82	—	—	4	60.00	—	—	31,954.30
1982/83	243	312.81	11	14.90	7	1,180.00	4	1,180.00	—	—	148,230.66

The dash (—) means no pelts were recorded.

* These figures are available for every year from 1957/58 to 1982/83.

Source: GNWT Renewable Resources.

licence year in which they are trapped nor from the trapper's home community. A pelt may be sold to an "intermediary" who may later export it; only then is it recorded. This accounting method distorts community figures, and causing anomalies such as sealskins being sold in Fort Liard. According to Tinling, figures spanning more than a decade provides a reliable indicator of the trapping effort in an area (personal communication). Because annual statistics based on Fur Export Tax returns do not reflect well the magnitude of the annual trapping effort of a community, figures up to the mid-1970's are less useful for monitoring change. According to Tinling, data based on sales to local dealers, auction and private buyers is much more accurate than that based on fur export tax returns. The main weakness of the new collection system may be that a relatively small number of trappers do not provide records of all sales to private individuals.

In spite of the limitations, these fur statistics can play a supporting role in our socio-economic monitoring project. The main reasons are:

1. The length of the records allows the establishment of a trend.
2. The information is more complete than our data on trapping, i.e., the GNWT figures provide detailed data by species of the animal as well as the cash value of these furs.
3. The GNWT figures show regional trends as well as trends by all communities in the NWT.

2.3.2 Trapper Income ranges, number of active trappers and total fur dollars by licence year and community or region.

Table 2.2 contains the data for Fort Simpson trappers from 1973/74 and 1982/83. Such information is available from 1973/74 to

Table 2.2

Distribution of Trappers' Income for Fort Simpson, 1973/74 and 1982/83*

	1973/74	1982/83
Total Number of Trappers	56	105
Number of Trappers over $400	24	--
Number of Trappers over $600	--	51
Total Fur Dollars	$31,428.42	$148,230.66
$400 to $1,000	10	--
$600 to $1,000	--	11
$1,000 to $2,000	8	17
$2,000 to $3,000	5	6
$3,000 to $4,000	--	8
$4,000 to $5,000	--	4
$5,000 to $6,000	--	--
$6,000 to $7,000	--	--
$7,000 to $8,000	1	3
$8,000 and over	--	2
Average	$561.22	$1,411.72

* The figures are available for each year from 1973/74 to 1982/83.

SOURCE: GNWT Renewable Resources.

1982/83. Data for 1983/84 is expected to be available in September 1984.

Any person who has a General Hunting Licence (GHL) and sells at least one pelt to "outside" auctions, local fur dealers or private buyers (proof by receipt) is considered an active trapper for that year. Trappers income is grouped into ten categories: $400-1,000, $600-1,000, $1,000-2,000, $2,000-3,000, $3,000-4,000, $4,000-5,000, $5,000-6,000, $6,000-7,000, $7,000-8,000, and over $8,000. Trappers having annual fur sales of at least $600 (minimum of $400 from 1973/74 to 1976/77) qualify for the Trappers Incentive Grant.

Evaluation. These GNWT figures on number of trappers, total fur sales and the distribution of these sales by number of trappers provides an important record of change over time. For example, in Table 2.2, the increase in fur sales from 1973/74 to 1982/83 was nearly five-fold (from $31,000 to $148,000) for Fort Simpson. At the same time the number of trappers almost doubled from 56 to 105. As a result, the average income from fur sales in 1982/83 was nearly triple the 1973/74 figure ($561 to $1,412).

Some problems exist with this data but these shortcomings do not seriously damage the data (particularly if the limitations are clearly stated when the fur data is presented). The major problems are discussed below.

This data is based on sales to local dealers, auctions and private buyers. Minor distortion in the reported number of active trappers and income of individual trappers may stem from the Trappers

Incentive Grant[1] as well as unreported sales to individuals. The Trappers Incentive Grant may come into play in the following situations: for example, a trapper earning $7,000 will receive twice as much grant money if he sells his furs on his wife's GHL as well as his own. On the other hand, members of a trapping unit may sell their pelts under one person's name to have an income of $600 to qualify for the grant. Commonly, such units comprise members of an extended family. Another distortion may occur if one person of a trapping unit (father) sells all the furs caught by the group.

Total fur dollars does not include the value of pelts used domestically or in handicrafts nor those discarded due to poor handling, scavenger damage or unreached prime. Neither does it account for the country food for furbearers (or the game shot while trapping). The gross value of the trapping economy is obviously underestimated by fur sales. However, operating and overhead costs and the human effort required to maintain a successful trapline have not been deducted from gross revenues.[2]

2.3.3 Number of General Hunting Licence (GHL) holders by community and region.

Table 2.3 contains the number of trappers by community in the Inuvik and Fort Smith regions as of August 31, 1983.

---

[1] The Trapper's Incentive Grant pays 10 percent of trapping income to trappers earning a minimum of $600; the maximum amount issued is $300.

[2] For a comment on this question, see J. C. Stabler (1977), "The Report of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry, Vol. I: A Socio-Economic Critique," Musk-Ox, No. 20, pp. 57-62.

Table 2.3

Number of General Hunting Licenses by Community
as of August 31, 1983

Community Name	Community #	# GHL
Inuvik Region		
Aklavik	401	351
Arctic Red River	403	35
Colville Lake	304	44
Fort Franklin	303	122
Fort Good Hope	302	174
Fort McPherson	402	276
Fort Norman	301	114
Inuvik	400	525
Norman Wells	300	53
Paulatuk	408	59
Sachs Harbour	406	77
Tuktoyaktuk	405	237
Port Radium/Echo Bay	305/306	2
Total		**2,069**
Fort Smith Region		
Hay River	109	352
Fort Liard	203	75
Fort Providence	110	223
Fort Resolution	101	257
Fort Simpson	200	328
Fort Smith	100	371
Lac La Marte	114	67
Nahanni Butte	202	22
Pine Point	108	70
Rae	106	376
Rae Lakes	120	46
Reliance	113	24
Snare Lakes	135	11
Trout Lake	206	7
Wrigley	204	64
Yellowknife	105	620
Jean-Marie River	201	19
Kikisa Lake	208	4
Detah	104	1
Snowdrift	103	88
Edzo	119	8
Total		**3,033**

General Hunting Licences (GHL) entitled holders to trap fur-bearing animals and to hunt game birds and animals. The GHL number is used on fur receipts and this fact alone requires the trapper to validate his GHL each year.

Each hunter and trapper must have their own licence: it is illegal to use another person's licence (Wildlife Ordinance Sec. 15). A person 16 years of age or older is eligible for a GHL if they were entitled to one under the old law (Game Ordinance) or if they live in the NWT and have not been away for more than five years or if a parent has held or could have held a GHL (Sec. 19). Upon the approval of the local Hunters and Trappers Association (HTA), Canadian citizens and landed immigrants who have lived in the NWT more than five years may be issued a GHL; those who have lived in the NWT at least two years may be issued a Special GHL or Special Trapping Licence. Unlike native GHL holders, the above holders are subject to catch limitations or cancellations according to the perception of the Hunters and Trappers Association (HTA) or Band Council (in absence of an HTA) of the welfare of the species (Sec. 18). Children under 16 years of age do not need a licence if they are with their parent or guardian (Sec. 21(5)). A licence may be issued to a native person under 16 years of age if he must hunt to take care of himself or his family.

Exclusive rights to furbearers in an area are conferred by Registered Trapping Area Licences or Registered Group Trapping Area Licences. Few of these licences are issued, as trappers do not want to be restricted to one area for five years.

Evaluation. The GHL data indicates the proportion of the community population involved in hunting rather than in trapping. Virtually all native families have at least one member with a GHL.

The reported number of GHL holders does not include those few persons (generally southerners) having special General Hunting Licences or Special Trapping Licences. As natives comprise almost all of the GHL holders, a ratio of GHL holders to native adult population may reveal the degree of interest in hunting and trapping in native communities. Less than 65 percent[1] of the native population is 15 years of age or older and of this age group approximately two-thirds hold GHL's. GHL's confer important "traditional" recognition to natives and the number of licence holders remains very stable. Consequently community GHL statistics may indicate the level of hunting activity.

2.4 Reports Available

GNWT Department of Renewable Resources

--------. 1983. "Assistance Programs." NWT Wildlife Notes No. 9. May 1983.

--------. 1983. Draft Strategic Plan Department of Renewable Resources. H & H Printing Services Ltd., Yellowknife.

--------. 1979. Wildlife Ordinance NWT: Special English Version. 1979. GNWT Wildlife Service.

--------. n.d. Summary of Regulations Pertaining to Trapping in the NWT.

---

[1] This is based on 1983 population projections for Inuvik and Fort Smith regions (GNWT Bureau of Statistics).

Hamelin, Louis-Edmond. 1979. "The Back to the Land Program." Contribution to the Northwest Territories Population Studies 1961-1985. Report to the Science Advisory Board, pp. 24-26.

Tinling, R.B. 1982. NWT Fur Production 1957/58 to 1978/79. NWT Wildlife Service, Yellowknife. Information Report No. 1.

Tinling, R. 1982. The Wild Fur Industry of Canada and the NWT Resource Development Section, NWT Wildlife Service.

Other Statistics—Background Information

Statistics Canada. Agricultural Statistics Division. Fur Production. Catalogue No. 23-207. Department of Supply and Services, Ottawa. (published annually)

Lists annual total number of pelts and fur dollars produced in the NWT.

2.5 Assessment and Analysis

The number of active trappers and the value of fur sales are the best available indicators of trapping activity. In the analysis of these statistics several assumptions are made. These are:

1. as fur prices rise, the number of active trappers and the value of fur sales may increase.
2. as populations of furbearers decline, the number of active trappers and value of fur sales may also decline.
3. as wage employment increases, the number of active trappers and the size of fur sales may decline.

The value of the GNWT data is partly related to the strength of relationships, such as the importance of trapping to natives as measured by cash income, number of trappers, etc. In the following pages, some preliminary analysis provides the reader with a feeling for the usefulness of the fur statistics.

2.5.1 Northwest Territories

Pelt prices in the NWT reached an all time high (average price was $26.81) in 1978/79. By 1982/83, the annual average pelt price declined 45 percent to $14.69. Total fur sales and number of trappers also peaked in the late 1970's and then declined. The annual number of trappers and value of fur sales for the NWT is shown in Table 2.4. For the period 1973/74 to 1982/83. These figures indicate annual fluctuations which appear to be related. This relationship is probably due to fur prices. The correlation between number of trappers and fur sales is very strong (.85).

2.5.2 Inuvik and Fort Smith Regions

A similar pattern of increases and decreases in number of trappers and fur sales occurred over the same time period in the administrative regions of Inuvik and Fort Smith as shown in Table 2.5. Again, the influence of high prices in 1978/79 seems to have increased the number of trappers and fur sales.

2.5.3 Norman Wells

Fur production at Norman Wells has decreased since 1978/79 and virtually ceased in the last three licence years (1980/81 to 1982/83). The number of trappers at Norman Wells has always been small, supporting the argument that Norman Wells is not a trapping-oriented center. Since 1973/74 there have never been more than 9 active trappers (less than 3 percent of the community population). The absence of trapping activity in 1982/83 may suggest that the Norman Wells project has drawn the 1981/82 trapper into the wage economy. However, the absolute decrease

Table 2.4

Northwest Territories Fur Sales and Number of Trappers*

	Number of Active Trappers	Total Fur Sales (x $1,000)
1973/74	3,426	2,471
1974/75	3,282	1,749
1975/76	3,413	2,772
1976/77	4,089	3,860
1977/78	3,679	3,411
1978/79	3,925	5,746
1979/80	4,319	5,334
1980/81	4,336	5,029
1981/82	3,635	3,726
1982/83	3,167	2,795
Average	3,727.1	3,689.3

* The relationship between number of active trappers and total fur sales was statistically tested by a correlation technique. A correlation of 1.0 indicates a perfect relationship while 0.85 reflects a strong relationship, that is as numbers of active trappers increases, so does the total fur sales. Standard deviation for trappers is 422.1; for fur sales, 1,322.0, correlation is 0.854.

SOURCE: GNWT Renewable Resources.

Table 2.5

Fur Sales and Number of Trappers,
Fort Smith and Inuvik Regions

	Number of Trappers		Total Fur Sales (dollars)	
	Fort Smith	Inuvik	Fort Smith	Inuvik
1973/74	798	699	288,738	445,665
1974/75	829	637	299,239	344,285
1975/76	983	442	520,499	763,107
1976/77	1,123	809	969,064	1,017,537
1977/78	1,035	838	954,012	1,092,903
1978/79	1,141	865	1,933,660	1,861,903
1979/80	1,300	887	1,847,536	1,234,012
1980/81	1,318	892	1,705,706	1,167,441
1981/82	1,116	759	1,511,488	1,048,707
1982/83	1,045	733	1,103,596	966,322

SOURCE: GNWT Renewable Resources.

in trappers over the past few years is small and some or all of the decrease may be due to declining prices, retirement/death of trappers or migration/selling furs to another community. This decline is shown in Table 2.6.

2.5.4 Fort Norman

Fort Norman recorded its largest fur production ($108,185) in 1978/79 (Table 2.7). This was followed by a peak in the number of active trappers (53) in 1979/80. By 1980/81 these values had decreased to $39,327 (64 percent decrease) and 39 (26 percent decrease) respectively. Fur sales increased to over $70,000 in 1981/82 and 1982/83 but the number of active trappers remained at the same level. With the 1983 pipeline work, there may be a change in the number of trappers in the 1983/84 figures.

2.5.5 Fort Simpson and Wrigley

The value of fur production has been steadily increasing since the late 1970's and peaked in 1981/82 ($188,537 in Fort Simpson and $142,570 in Wrigley) (see Table 2.8). The following year, fur sales decreased approximately 20 percent. This decrease corresponds with the pipeline activity which began in January 1983 but it is more likely due to declining prices since the number of active trappers did not follow this trend. The number of active trappers in Wrigley remained stable at 54 in 1982/83 after peaking at this level the previous year. The number of Fort Simpson trappers increased to 103 in 1982/83. As with Fort Norman, pipeline construction in 1983 may have affected the number of

Table 2.6

Trappers and Fur Sales at Norman Wells

	Number of Active Trappers	Total Fur Sales
1973/74	7	4,603
1974/75	7	2,028
1975/76	9	3,670
1976/77	8	1,711
1977/78	3	2,194
1978/79	6	19,657
1979/80	4	9,815
1980/81	4	502
1981/82	1	410
1982/83	0	0

Table 2.7

Trappers and Fur Sales at Fort Norman

	Number of Active Trappers	Total Fur Sales
1973/74	58	15,891
1974/75	42	17,813
1975/76	35	24,927
1976/77	45	42,260
1977/78	42	57,892
1978/79	46	108,185
1979/80	53	87,205
1980/81	39	39,327
1981/82	42	75,617
1982/83	38	73,709

Table 2.8

Trappers and Fur Sales at Fort Simpson and Wrigley

	Number of Active Trappers		Total Fur Sales (dollars)	
	Fort Simpson	Wrigley	Fort Simpson	Wrigley
1973/74	56	28	31,428	9,941
1974/75	72	38	13,269	20,367
1975/76	96	37	24,358	13,561
1976/77	115	7	50,694	6,678
1977/78	112	44	55,059	34,118
1978/79	93	41	88,173	27,819
1979/80	103	45	148,188	84,634
1980/81	124	44	183,270	91,187
1981/82	97	54	188,537	142,570
1982/83	105	54	148,231	111,427

trappers in 1983/84. Subsequent years statistics may be able to demonstrate whether this is the case.

2.5.6 Another View

The comparison of these data to native population and community income provide another view of the level of importance of trapping at the community level. For example, the number of trappers by community as a percentage of Indian population is shown in Table 2.9 while trapping income by community income is found in Table 2.11.

Communities may be classified by the average percentage of the native population actively involved in trapping in years 1977/78, 1979/80 and 1980/81. The proportion of natives holding GHL's is much higher by communities than is the percentage of trappers (Tables 2.9 and 2.10). Also, the percentage holding GHL's is considerably higher for large centers than small ones. The percentage of GHL holders actively trapping varied considerably (from 14 percent to 80 percent) as shown in Table 2.10. The value of 14 percent for Trout Lake, a traditional community, may be explained by the fact that some of the Trout Lake residents are registered for GHLs at Fort Simpson. Consequently, there is a wide difference in the number of GHLs issued for Trout Lake residents and the number of persons at this community who are regarded as active trappers. This type of statistical "correction" is only possible by a person gaining an inside knowledge of such administrative idiosyncrasies by discussions with the appropriate public officials.

Table 2.11 shows trapping income for a community as a percentage of total community income. It is not surprising that this percentage

Table 2.9

Active Trappers as a Percentage of
Community Native Population

	1977/78	1979/80*	1980/81	Average
Norman Wells	5	6	4	5
Fort Simpson	18	20	21	20
Fort Norman	16	23	15	18
Fort Franklin	17	17	13	12
Fort Liaird	7	20	21	16
Nahanni Butte	16	24	25	22
Jean Marie River	18	20	19	19
Fort Providence (& Kakiska Lake)	23	27	26	25
Fort Good Hope	24	32	28	28
Trout Lake	21	32	34	32
Wrigley	27	29	34	30
Colville Lake	35	28	47	37

* Metis were not included in the 1979/80 native population. This would cause exaggerated percentages in communities with significant Metis populations because Metis are involved in trapping. Fort Good Hope, Fort Norman and, to a lesser extent, Jean Marie River appear to be the communities most distorted.

SOURCES: Trappers: GNWT Renewable Resources.

Native Population: GNWT Bureau of Statistics, Population Estimates by Region and Community, 1977 to 1981.

Table 2.10

Percentage of Trappers and GHL Holders
by Native Population in Community

Community	Native Population (1981)	Percent of Active Trappers*	No. of GHL** (1983)	Percent Holding GHL
Norman Wells	95	5	53	55.8
Fort Franklin	490	12	122	24.4
Fort Liard	365	16	75	20.5
Fort Norman	255	18	114	44.7
Jean Marie River	75	19	19	25.3
Fort Good Hope	425	28	174	40.9
Fort Providence	525	25	223	42.5
Nahanni Butte	75	22	22	29.3
Fort Simpson	600	20	328	54.7
Wrigley	135	30	64	47.4
Trout Lake	50	32	7	14.0
Colville Lake	55	37	44	80.0

* The active trapper figure is an annual average based on 1977 to 1981 figures.

** GHL refers to General Hunting License.

Table 2.11

Trapping Income as a Percentage of Community Income*

	1975/76	1976/77	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81
Fort Franklin	4	6	10	16	14	5
Fort Good Hope	—	—	—	25	19	10
Fort Norman	—	—	—	10	7	3
Norman Wells	—	—	—	1	0.2	0.01
Fort Liard	—	—	—	8	7	5
Fort Providence (and Kakiska Lake)	—	—	—	13	14	9
Fort Simpson (and Jean Marie River)	—	—	—	—	—	2
Fort Smith Region	0.4	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.7
Inuvik Region	2.6	8.1	3.1	4.6	2.7	2.0
Cumulated NWT	1.4	1.7	1.3	2.0	1.7	1.3

* Year of income data was that of the latter half of the licence year. Data is available from the GNWT Bureau of Statistics only for communities filing at least 100 tax returns.

-- = data not available

SOURCES: GNWT Department of Renewable Resources and Bureau of Statistics.

reached a maximum in 1978/79, the year average pelt prices peaked. Since then the percentage has steadily declined. Trapping income for the NWT as a percentage of total income has never been greater than 2 percent. The proportion has never been greater than 1 percent in Fort Smith Region nor less than 2 percent in Inuvik Region. The 12 communities listed in Table 2.11 have greater than the NWT figure except Norman Wells. Fort Good Hope, Fort Franklin and Fort Providence may be assumed to be the most "land-oriented" as their percentages are highest. Even so, these figures are declining (mainly a function of lower prices).

Fur production by value as a percentage of community income may be expected to significantly decrease if trapping production decreases and income from wage employment (particularly that stimulated by Norman Wells construction) increases. These fur production figures provide insights into the importance of traditional activities in the community's economy.

The following weaknesses exist in these data:

1. short time span for which some of the data is available, e.g., community income data is available for 1976-1981 from the Bureau of Statistics, GHL holders 1981 from Renewable Resources, and native community data from Bureau of Statistics.

2. community income is only reported for communities filing at least 100 tax returns. For many of the communities of interest, income data only became available in 1979.

3. Metis are not always identified in the native population.

4. fur sales underestimate gross trapping income by not including pelts used domestically or in handicrafts and the country food obtained while trapping.

5. variation in fur prices affects total value of fur production (Table 2.12).

2.6 Future Development

Development of renewable resources is the "first" priority for the GNWT Department of Renewable Resources (Cournoyea, Minister of Renewable Resources, NWT Legislative Assembly Hansard, May 16, 1984, unedited transcript, p. 286). This is in recognition of the importance of renewable resources as economic base of the small native communities and its contribution to a stable social, economic and political environment (Cournoyea, Hansard, May 16, 1984, p. 287). Being more stable than short term nonrenewable resource projects, the renewable resource sector has the potential to be an economic buffer and a significant source of income[1] (Matthews and Meyers, Environmental Impact and Assessment, GNWT Renewable Resources).

The Department of Renewable Resources has been administering assistance programs (e.g., Trappers Incentive Grant, Special ARDA which contributes up to 65 percent of the cost of one time equipment purchases, $5 subsidy on seal pelts in 1992/83) to help hunters and trappers overcome the problems of their industry. The Fur Marketing Corporation enabled trappers to sell pelts through major fur auctions in southern Canada which may result in increased returns of up to 25%. A

---

[1] In the eastern Arctic, renewable resources provide as much income as all other sources of income put together. This is possible because there has been less contact with "southerners" and development (Meyers and Matthews).

Table 2.12

Indices of Average Pelt Price and Fur Sales
in the Fort Smith and Inuvik Regions

	Average Pelt Price*	Price Index	Index of Fur Sales in Fort Smith Region	Index of Fur Sales in Inuvik Region
1973/74	13.20	1.00	1.00	1.00
1074/75	9.03	0.68	1.04	0.77
1975/76	10.38	0.79	1.80	1.71
1976/77	10.36	0.78	3.36	2.28
1977/78	10.44	0.79	3.30	2.45
1978/79	26.81	2.03	6.70	4.18
1979/80	23.03	1.74	6.40	2.77
1980/81	18.42	1.40	5.91	2.62
1981/82	16.73	1.27	5.23	2.35
1982/83	14.69	1.11	3.82	2.17

* Determined by dividing total fur dollars by number of pelts. Note that species prices are independent of each other and may have peaked at a time other than that of the "average". Quality of pelts also determines price.

SOURCE: Statistics Canada, 1974 to 1983 (annually). Fur Production. Catalogue 23-207. Minister of Supply and Service, Canada, Ottawa.

campaign against the antitrapping lobbyists has also been established. Activities that will protect and stimulate the northern fur market, such as a sealskin industry in Baffin and rebates on fur coats for northerners, have been suggested (Hansard, May 10, p. 23). Curley, Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, believes extensive use of furs must begin in the north before the rest of the country supports the fur industry (Hansard, May 10, p. 23).

Intersettlement trade of country food is believed to have the potential to stimulate economic development, improve nutrition and maintain culture (Cournoyea, Hansard, May 16, 1984, p. 288). At present the only country food store in the western NWT is Ulu Foods in Inuvik. The number of such stores is expected to grow as schools want to serve country food for lunches,[1] as native people hunt less and non-natives acquire a taste for country food. Commercial outlets are needed because General Hunting Licence holders can only sell or trade a limited amount of meat and fur to other GHL holders. Hunters who receive commercial tags shall gain another source of cash income.

Reestablishment of fur farming is being encouraged by the GNWT. The possible advantages would be improved quality, production of exotic species (e.g., blue fox) and crossbreeding to achieve different colored pelts. Fur farming may not be necessary to increase productivity in the Mackenzie Valley for the next 25 years (Matthews). At present there is plenty of land and furbearers for the number of active trappers.

---

[1]Dene band told to buy caribou from Ulu Foods in Inuvik. Native Press 14(12):1. July 15, 1984. Yellowknife.

Success will require compatibility with the native lifestyle and overcoming the fear that fur farming will destroy the market (Tinling).

The wood bison herd at Fort Providence is at the point where harvesting can begin. The scarcity of game at Trout Lake has created an interest in bison ranching (Matthews). Reindeer are being farmed south of Tuktoyaktuk and their meat is being exported south. The potential of each community milking caribou to supply their needs will probably be determined by compatibility with the native way of life (Myers).

4.7 Summary and Conclusions

The number of active trappers and the value of fur production by community are the most useful data forms available for monitoring change in trapping activity. A decline in number of active trappers and value of fur sales in the 1980's corresponding to declining prices has been documented at the territorial, regional and community level. Data for the time period extending beyond Norman Wells construction will be necessary to determine changes attributable to construction activities.

An overview of the limitations of the data considered is provided in Table 2.13.

Table 2.13

Overview of Limitations of Data Collected

	Data Type	Limitations
1.	Number and value of pelts by species, community	- data up to mid-1970's is based on the Fur Export Tax receipts and do not accurately indicate annual trapping effort. - Since the mid-1970s, the data has been gathered from both fur buyers and trappers. These data are considered much more accurate.
2.	Trapper income ranges, number of active trappers and total fur dollars by licence year and community or region	- community data may be aggregated. - only minor distortions caused by reporting procedures.
3.	Number of GHL holders by community and region.	- only 1983 data available - the number does not reflect the degree of trapping activty.

3. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Social assistance is provided to people experiencing financial difficulty in meeting their basic needs of food, clothing and shelter. In general, social assistance is requested only as the need arises and is not considered a regular source of income. Few people receive payments throughout the entire year. The number of cases and the total value of payments indicate a community's level of welfare dependence. Many northern communities have a weak employment base characteristic of the "mixed" economy based on trapping, wage employment and government payments (e.g., social assistance payments).

3.1 Contact Person

Sheldon Nider

Planner, Information Systems
Resource Development Policy
Policy, Planning and Support Services
GNWT Department of Social Services
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

(403) 873-7155

3.2 Data Collection

A person in need of financial aid contacts the local social welfare officer who completes the application form for social assistance (Table 3.1). This form collects a wide variety of socio-economic

Table 3.1

GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
CANADA

Northwest Territories

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

APPLICATION TYPE
- ☐ SOCIAL ASSISTANCE
- ☐ DAY CARE
- ☐ OTHER

IDENTITY

APPLICANT'S LAST NAME (PLEASE PRINT) | FIRST NAMES | HEALTH CARE PLAN NO.

USUAL RESIDENCE | LOCATION | DATE OF BIRTH (DAY MONTH YEAR) | SEX M/F (1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F) | SOCIAL INSURANCE NO.

APPLICANT'S TELEPHONE | NAME OF EMPLOYER | EMPLOYER'S TELEPHONE

DEPENDANTS

SPOUSE'S LAST NAME | FIRST NAMES | BIRTH YEAR | HEALTH CARE PLAN NO | SOCIAL INSURANCE NO. OF SPOUSE

1

	NAME	SEX M/F	BIRTH YEAR	APPLICANT'S RELATIONSHIP		NAME	SEX M/F	BIRTH YEAR	APPLICANT'S RELATIONSHIP
2		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN	7		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN
3		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN	8		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN
4		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN	9		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN
5		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDMAN	10		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN
6		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN	11		1 ☐ M 2 ☐ F		1 ☐ PARENT 2 ☐ GUARDIAN

PERSONAL

MARITAL STATUS (X ONE)
- 1 ☐ SINGLE
- 2 ☐ MARRIED OR COMMON LAW
- 3 ☐ DIVORCED
- 4 ☐ SEPARATED
- 5 ☐ WIDOWED

HOUSING (X ONE)
- 1 ☐ OWN HOME
- 2 ☐ RENT FROM HOUSING CORP
- 3 ☐ RENT FROM OTHER
- 4 ☐ ROOM AND BOARD
- 5 ☐ INSTITUTION
- 6 ☐ OTHER

SHARED HOUSING
- 1 ☐ YES
- 2 ☐ NO

EDUCATION
APPLICANT ☐ SPOUSE ☐ YEARS

USUAL OCCUPATION (X ONE)

	APPLICANT	SPOUSE
1	☐	☐ TRAPPER HUNTER FISHERMAN
2	☐	☐ HANDICRAFTS
3	☐	☐ SERVICE
4	☐	☐ GENERAL LABOUR
5	☐	☐ TRADE TECHNICAL
6	☐	☐ CLERICAL PROFESSIONAL
7	☐	☐ HOMEMAKER
8	☐	☐ NO WORK HISTORY
9	☐	☐ OTHER

EMPLOYMENT (X ONE)

	APPLICANT	SPOUSE
1	☐	☐ FULL TIME
2	☐	☐ PART TIME
3	☐	☐ SEASONAL
4	☐	☐ PERIODIC
5	☐	☐ DOES NOT WORK

POSSIBLE PROBLEM AREAS (X ONE)
- 1 ☐ ALCOHOL DRUGS
- 2 ☐ EMOTIONAL/MENTAL
- 3 ☐ FAMILY
- 4 ☐ BEHAVIOURAL
- 5 ☐ UNEMPLOYABLE
- 6 ☐ FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

TRAINING (X ONE)

	APPLICANT	SPOUSE
1	☐	☐ VOCATIONAL
2	☐	☐ APPRENTICE
3	☐	☐ ADULT EDUCATION
4	☐	☐ OTHER

MONTHLY BUDGET

MONTHLY EARNED INCOME

WAGES 1 _____
HANDICRAFTS 2 _____
FUR/FISH 3 _____
*OTHER EARNINGS ☐ _____
TOTAL EARNED _____ → _____
LESS ALLOWABLE _____
NET EARNED _____

MONTHLY UNEARNED INCOME

OLD AGE BENEFITS 1 _____
UNEMPLOYMENT INS. 2 _____
RENT/BOARD INCOME 3 _____
ASSETS 4 _____
*OTHER ☐ _____
TOTAL UNEARNED _____ → _____
NET MONTHLY INCOME _____

*SEE MANUAL FOR CODES

MONTHLY NEEDS

NUMBER OF PERSONS _____ SCALE _____

FOOD 01 _____
CLOTHING 02 _____
RENT 03 _____
FUEL/UTILITIES 04 _____
HOUSEHOLD 05 _____
PERSONAL 06 _____
AGED DISABLED 07 _____
OTHER ☐ _____
OTHER ☐ _____
OTHER ☐ _____
OTHER ☐ _____

OTHER NEED CODES
- 08 ROOM AND BOARD
- 09 MEDICAL BOARD
- 10 SPECIAL DIET
- 11 BURIAL/FUNERAL
- 12 TELEPHONE
- 13 FOR EMPLOYMENT
- 14 FOR EDUCATION
- 15 ITEMS FOR HANDICAPPED
- 16 EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE
- 17 COMFORTS ALLOWANCE
- 18 DAY CARE

SEE MANUAL FOR OTHER CODES

TOTAL MONTHLY NEEDS _____
LESS NET MONTHLY INCOME _____
BUDGET DEFICIT _____
LESS RECOVERY (SPECIFY IN COMMENTS SECTION) _____
MONTHLY AMOUNT ▶ _____

PAYMENT TO (X ONE)
- 1 ☐ APPLICANT OR SPOUSE
- 2 ☐ SUPPLIER

ASSISTANCE (X ONE)

TYPE	REASON
1 ☐ TRANSIENT	1 ☐ ILL HEALTH/DISABLED
2 ☐ FIRST TIME	2 ☐ DEPENDENT CHILDREN
3 ☐ PERIODIC	3 ☐ UNEMPLOYED BUT ABLE

REFUSAL REASON (X ONE)
- 1 ☐ BUDGET SURPLUS
- 2 ☐ OTHER RESOURCES
- 3 ☐ WITHHOLDING INFORMATION
- 4 ☐ NOT LOOKING

PAYMENT FOR PERIOD OF (DAY MONTH YEAR) TO (DAY MONTH YEAR) | CHEQUE NUMBER | AMOUNT

TO _____ _____ .
TO _____ _____ .
TO _____ _____ .

information. For example, the local community social services worker determines the dollar value of total monthly needs, net income (earned and unearned) and the resulting budget deficit from three factors: (1) the application, (2) the interview, and (3) the GNWT social assistance ordinance and regulations. The main needs listed on the form are food, clothing, rent, fuel/utilities, household expenditures and personal expenditures. A cheque is issued to the applicant by the social welfare officer.

The social welfare officer sends copies of the social assistance application forms to Yellowknife where this information is checked, entered into the computer and coded to a "batch month". Batch (accounting) month data is not an accurate record of actual monthly assistance payments for a calendar month because "batch" information refers to those application forms received by Yellowknife in a certain month rather than the payments made for a certain month. In contrast, "assistance month" data records the number of social assistant applications and the payments for a particular month. Assistance month data is not finalized until at least three months after the batch month to ensure all social assistance information for that month has been received by Yellowknife. This procedure results in consistent, accurate reporting of monthly assistance.

The data collected on the application form is stored in the computer and filed according to the applicant's Health Care Plan number. This prevents double counting the month's cases in the event an applicant applies for assistance more than once in a month. If more than one reason, need or income source was specified on the application,

the applicant is included in the case count of the category (e.g., particular assistance reason) where the dollar value is greatest. Monetary amounts specified on the applications for various categories are accumulated by like kind.

3.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation

All social assistance information is taken from the applicant's form, stored on computer and some of the data is produced regularly as computer print-outs. Other data, such as the number of dependents, marital status, housing conditions, education levels, employment record, training, usual occupation and social problem areas (alcohol/drugs, emotional/mental, family, behavioural, unemployable, or financial management) are not contained in the regularly produced computer print-outs. However, this data can be obtained as "special" computer runs.

The three main print-out reports are:

1. The Minister's Report,
2. The Social Assistance Need Amount Report,
3. The Social Assistance Earnings Report.

Each of these reports is described and assessed. The most useful report for socio-economic monitoring of communities is the Minister's Report.

3.3.1 Minister's Report

In this report, social assistance data is presented by assistance reason, statistic's month and applicant's usual place of residence. These data are reported for a period of twelve months (usually fiscal year) and includes:

1. amount paid out in social assistance,
2. number of cases (applicants who receive assistance),
3. number of persons assisted (including applicants and their dependents).

Reasons for assistance are listed as ill health or disabled, dependent children, unemployed but able, not enough income and other.

Table 3.2 contains a sample of some of the 1982 statistics for Fort Simpson. The actual report breaks the figures into monthly totals. This type of information is available since April 1976. The services of a private computer system (Dataline) were leased for the period April 1976 to March 1980 and they produced the first reports. Now the GNWT produces these reports internally.

Evaluation. The Minister's Report is a most useful document due to its presentation of social data by statistics month and its breakdown of data by residence location and reason for assistance. As a result, it is sensitiive to socio-economic change at the community level. The number of cases and persons along with expenditures are good variables to indicate the amount of change. Over five to ten year periods, these annual totals may detect trends while monthly figures provide insight into seasonal patterns.[1]

The Minister's Report has certain limitations for detecting socio-economic change. Limiting factors are as follows:

---

[1]Normal winter patterns (e.g., January and February) are characterized by a high level of social assistance payments; caseload seems to decline once people are out on the land.

Table 3.2

Minister's Report for Fort Simpson, 1982

Major Categories Assistance Reason	Amount Paid*	Number of Cases	Number of Persons	% of Persons
Ill health/disabled	$24,217	98	120	15.5
Dependent children	$25,648	109	249	32.3
Unemployed but able	$12,148	73	184	23.8
Not enough income	$ 8,447	42	110	14.3
Other	$15,851	62	109	14.1
Total	$86,313	384	772	100.0

* The Minister's Report printout presents these statistics for each month. Therefore seasonal variations could be recorded.

SOURCE: Minister's Report, May 11, 1983.

1. The data was not designed for socio-economic monitoring of the community but for fiscal reporting by the Department of Social Services.

2. Attitudes of the social workers influence their effectiveness in promoting public awareness of assistance programs and in so doing affect caseload and assistance levels.

3. Increases in assistance payments and changes in qualifiers for social assistance has weakened the comparative value of the data over time.

4. Many factors affect the level of social assistance in the complex socio-economic environment of a northern community.

5. The small proportion of social assistance recipients to the community population may limit the usefulness of social assistance data as a community social indicator.

6. The assumption that social problems confronting people on social assistance is much greater than for the rest of the community (may also be due to the lower capacity of social assistance recipients to handle problems).

These limitations apply not only to the print-out called the Minister's Report but also to all social assistance print-outs. In this report, two other regularly produced print-outs are presented—Social Assistance Need Amount Report and Social Assistance Earnings Report. I have also commented on other print-outs produced by Social Services.

3.3.2 Social Assistance Need Amount Report

Type of need by dollars, number of cases, statistics month and usual residence location for the fiscal year (or other twelve month period). Totals and monthly averages of number of cases and need per case are also given.

Although there are 32 valid need codes that may be specified on the social assistance application form, reports usually only list fourteen. The first seven categories are fixed (food, clothing, rent, fuel/utilities, household, personal, aged/disabled), followed by the

seven next highest ranking needs including the category "other" if necessary.

The 1980/81 need statistics for Fort Simpson are provided as an example of the Social Assistance Need Report in Table 3.3. While Table 3.3 uses annual totals for various categories, the actual print-out shows monthly totals. This data form is available since April 1976.[1]

Evaluation. "Need" statistics provide a general view of the needs of a community. While "basic" need expenditures (food, clothing, accommodation) do not seem to change much over time, new social priorities funded by Social Services, such as daycare, may reflect socio-economic change (e.g., as more women participate in the wage economy).

3.3.3 Social Assistance Earnings Report

Source of income by dollars, number of cases, statistical month and residence location for fiscal year.

Earned income is broken into four categories—wages, handicrafts, fish/fur and other. Unearned income categories include old age benefits, unemployment insurance payments, rent/board income, assets and other. Living allowances are deduced from earned income which is added to unearned income to determine net monthly income. The average number of cases and income per case by type of income is also given.

Table 3.4 contains 1980/81 income statistics for Fort Simpson.

---

[1] A private computer system (Dataline) produced these data for 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 and for part of 1980. Since then the GNWT has produced these data internally.

Table 3.3

Social Assistance Needs Report for Fort Simpson
for 1980/81*

Needs	Annual Cost	Average Number of Cases/Month	Annual Average Cost/Case
Food	$ 85,833.00	37	$192.00
Clothing	$ 8,453.00	14	$ 43.00
Rent	$ 8,826.00	4	$154.00
Fuel/Utilities	$ 5,175.00	5	$ 72.00
Household	$ 1,938.00	12	$ 12.00
Personal	$ 1,275.00	10	$ 10.00
Aged/Disabled	$ 990.00	—	$ 90.00
Room and Board	$ 974.00	—	$162.00
Burial/Funeral	$ 909.00	—	$454.00
Incidentals/Employment	$ 567.00	—	$189.00
Emergency	$ 4,455.00	—	$742.00
Day Care	$ 100.00	—	$100.00
Nursing Home	$ 3,905.00	1	$195.00
Other	$ 3,469.00	5	$ 54.00
Total	$126,889.00	38	$274.00

* The Needs Report is recorded with monthly figures and therefore seasonal variations may be charted.

Table 3.4

Social Assistance Earnings Report
for Fort Simpson, 1980/81*

Source of Income	Annual Earnings	Average Number of Cases/Month	Average Cost/Case
Earned:			
Wages	$3,800.00	1	$165.00
Handicraft	650.00	—	65.00
Fur/Fish	245.00	—	122.00
Other Earnings	585.00	—	195.00
Total Earnings	$5,280.00	3	$138.00
Less: allowances	3,097.00	3	81.00
Net Earnings	**$2,183.00**	**2**	**$ 90.00**
Unearned:			
Old Age Benefits	$5,309.00	1	$331.00
UIC	320.00	—	160.00
Rent/Board	—	—	—
Assets	—	—	—
Other	200.00	—	66.00
Total U Unearned	**$5,829.00**	**1**	**$306.00**
Net Income	**$8,012.00**	**3**	**$195.00**

* The Earnings Report contains monthly figures which can show seasonal variations.

Data in this form is available for the period April 1980 to March 1984. Regional income data by dollars and number of cases was reported by Dataline for the period April 1976 to March 1980.

By analyzing annual earnings for 1981/82 social assistance recipients at Fort Simpson, several surprising results were observed. These are:

1. that earned wages comprised 73% of total earnings while fur/fish accounted for only 5%. These facts raise several questions: (a) does the dominance of earned wages reflect the community income pattern? (b) does the low percentage of fur/fish income mean that people living off the land are not on social assistance?
2. that old age benefits account for more income than the total of earned income ($5,309 to $5,280). Does this mean the unearned income (various government payments) plays such a large role in the rest of the community? For example, unearned income comprised 73% of net income.

Evaluation. Income statistics can be used as an indicator of change. The small number of cases shown in Table 3.4 (average number of cases is 3 while 37 cases are on social assistance—see Tables 3.3 and 3.4) may mean most income data was not collected by the field officer when the application form was completed. If the number of cases could be determined as a percentage of the community population earning these types of income, the numbers would be more meaningful. Unfortunately data for such comparisons are presently unavailable.

3.3.4 Ad-Hoc Reports

Special runs of any combination of information on the application forms and stored on the computer may be produced upon request (and creation of the appropriate program). Income (broken down as in the

income report), sum of needs and number of social assistance cases by occupation (as listed on the application form), community and month would be a useful special run report. Comparison of the above to the total number of wage earners in each industrial sector would provide a meaningful measure of socio-economic change in a community. Since the 1981 census has data on wage earners by industrial sector, figures could be produced for 1981 and for 1986.

3.4 Assessment and Analysis

3.4.1 The Indicators

Monthly expenditure and caseload, as reported in the printout called the Minister's Report, have been analysed. These variables have been graphed and totalled[1] by fiscal year (Tables 3.5 to 3.10) for "economic reasons,"[2] "dependent children" and total applicants. The time period under study is April 1977 to March 1984.

All persons receiving social assistance, including applicants' dependents, have also been calculated as a percentage of the community population for the months of July and January which are representative of low and high level assistance months respectively.

---

[1] In annual totals, caseload is reported as "case-months". This is the sum of the number of cases in each month of the year. It is not a count of the number of individual cases (applicants) and must be distinguished as such.

[2] Economic reasons include the "unemployed but able" and "not enough income" categories.

Table 3.5

Social Assistance Case Months by Economic Reasons

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	124	96	83	109	104	144	169
Wrigley	15	22	14	13	48	25	35
Fort Norman	61	30	17	60	57	36	34
Norman Wells	5	4	3	7	15	26	14
Fort Good Hope	125	109	124	58	204	259	255
Trout Lake	1	2	9	13	19	16	24
Fort Simpson Area	184	145	121	159	200	230	254
Inuvik South Area	336	325	331	334	629	668	625
Cumulated NWT	5,588	6,231	6,430	11,104	—	—	—

— data not presently available.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

Table 3.6

Social Assistance Expenditure for Economic Reasons

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	14,193	13,268	12,194	17,969	18,102	27,162	37,288
Wrigley	2,248	5,469	3,352	2,530	13,981	5,251	9,791
Fort Norman	16,624	11,061	5,483	19,260	18,857	10,330	10,357
Norman Wells	3,327	1,390	1,320	648	4,007	4,978	8,279
Fort Good Hope	29,586	30,720	34,066	15,255	66,173	93,777	94,039
Trout Lake	146	724	1,170	1,791	2,933	3,049	4,727
Fort Simpson Area	22,621	24,465	11,935	26,491	42,180	49,453	88,635
Inuvik South Area	90,327	103,318	109,840	112,418	217,911	268,797	248,582
Cumulated NWT	1,191,958	1,596,155	1,766,142	3,485,075	—	—	—

— data not presently available.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

Table 3.7

Social Assistance Case-Months for Reason of Dependent Children

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	172	152	158	155	120	106	100
Wrigley	20	11	2	7	17	11	5
Fort Norman	52	58	66	50	49	49	27
Norman Wells	3	3	1	19	5	0	6
Fort Good Hope	101	93	140	163	112	44	68
Trout Lake	31	30	26	36	35	22	19
Fort Simpson Area	268	250	222	243	218	166	169
Inuvik South Area	221	224	306	405	217	128	149
Cumulated NWT	3,184	3,501	3,523	4,150	—	—	—

— data not present available.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

Table 3.8

Social Assistance Expenditures for Reason of Dependent Children

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	26,623	40,881	43,446	46,362	28,249	27,435	30,348
Wrigley	3,183	3,408	435	1,570	4,362	2,315	1,485
Fort Norman	12,185	16,425	18,235	18,662	15,120	16,197	10,920
Norman Wells	365	543	60	4,396	1,120	0	6,554
Fort Good Hope	28,661	36,986	49,526	65,966	37,510	15,622	24,486
Trout Lake	10,198	9,038	9,286	10,317	10,400	5,836	6,275
Fort Simpson Area	61,497	77,885	72,345	76,095	59,446	39,350	54,065
Inuvik South Area	60,636	84,906	104,729	140,999	79,857	51,981	64,249
Cumulated NWT	864,045	1,090,326	1,168,280	1,470,552	—	—	—

— data presently unavailable.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

Table 3.9

Total Social Assistance Case-Months

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	505	469	378	462	401	401	394
Wrigley	74	95	56	83	112	68	73
Fort Norman	161	135	134	158	141	116	86
Norman Wells	21	19	4	27	25	33	26
Fort Good Hope	350	333	433	474	637	565	645
Trout Lake	36	41	38	63	57	45	58
Fort Simpson Area	742	754	555	721	659	625	659
Inuvik South Area	864	—	963	1,108	1,304	1,207	1,286
Cumulated NWT	16,696	17,847	17,708	22,168	—	—	—

— data not presently available.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

Table 3.10

Total Social Assistance Expenditures

Center/Area	1977/78	1978/79	1979/80	1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
Fort Simpson	70,276	85,761	81,390	104,267	80,607	94,034	97,103
Wrigley	10,815	18,642	10,961	15,521	26,772	15,895	19,133
Fort Norman	36,788	37,820	37,104	51,586	43,493	37,424	31,856
Norman Wells	6,489	4,301	1,380	5,645	7,228	8,656	17,368
Fort Good Hope	86,716	101,368	122,906	179,847	230,775	238,839	266,753
Trout Lake	10,735	13,450	10,877	14,345	14,158	10,207	13,831
Fort Simpson Area	129,139	164,353	135,672	165,366	159,673	157,158	171,541
Inuvik South Area	212,286	254,534	306,439	380,302	477,049	511,710	546,695
Cumulated NWT	3,682,933	4,695,318	5,028,901	6,973,731	—	—	—

— data not presently available.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.

3.4.2 Hypotheses

Hypotheses of the effects of the Norman Wells construction are as follows:

1. as construction activity increases, employment of local northerners increased and the number of persons on social assistance may decrease.
2. as more families have a "higher" cash income, social assistance expenditures and caseload may decrease, particularly in the "economic reason" category.
3. as the male and/or female heads of a household go to work, leaving the children without proper supervision, assistance for reason of "dependent children" may increase.

The testing of these hypotheses requires the release of individual data and the assistance of the local social worker who can provide additional information (or clarification) of the administrative data.

3.4.3 Northwest Territories

The Northwest Territories experienced an increase in expenditure $3,682,933 to $6,973,731 and case-months (16,696 to 22,168) from 1977/78 to 1980/81. The overall trend for this three year period is (1) a near doubling of social assistance payments, and (2) an increase of case-months by over one-third. Unfortunately statistics beyond this data are not available at present.

3.4.4 Inuvik South and Fort Simpson Areas

Inuvik South Area[1] experienced a steady increase in total expenditure and case-months since 1977/78 ($212,286 and 864 case-months to $546,694 and 1,286 case-months in 1983/84). Expenditure in the Fort Simpson Area[2] was also higher in 1983/84 ($171,541) than 1977/78 ($129,139) but has pretty well stabilized since 1980/81 ($165,366). Case-months have decreased from 721 in 1980/81 to 659 in 1983/84 (only a 5 percent increase over 1982/83). In both regions, economic reasons became more important than dependent children in the early 1980's. Case-months for these categories and regions increased slightly from 1982/83 to 1983/84 for all but "economic reasons" in Inuvik South.

An analysis of the GNWT annual figures on social assistance with those of its subregions is not possible because of the limited number of years for which statistics have been assembled. For 1977/78 to 1980/81, Fort Simpson Area has had a proportional smaller increase in social assistance payments than the NWT.

3.4.5 Fort Simpson

The annual total number of case months has been decreasing since 1977/78 (505) and appears to be levelling out at about 400. Despite this decrease, total expenditures have risen ($70,276 in 1976/77 to

---

[1]Inuvik South Area includes the communities of Fort Good Hope, Colville Lake, Fort Franklin, Fort Norman, and Norman Wells.

[2]Fort Simpson Area includes the communities of Fort Simpson Wrigley, Trout Lake, Nahanni Butte, Fort Liard, Fort Providence and Jean Marie River. Kakiska Lake, Willowlake River and Tungsten are also within this area but seldom receive any social assistance. Also, payments allocated to family at Kakiska Lake are shown in the Fort Providence figures for social assistance.

$97,103 in 1983/84—however the 1983/84 figure was only a 3 percent increase over 1982/83). The number of annual case-months for reason of dependent children has also steadily decreased from 172 in 1977/78 to 100 in 1983/84. "Economic" caseload and expenditure has been on an upward trend since 1979/80 ($12,194 issued to 83 case-months has increased to $37,288 and 169 case-months in 1983/84). Case-months increased by 25 (less than 20 percent) from 1982/83 to 1983/84.

There have been no obvious changes in already existing trends during the period of pipeline construction. This appears to support Drake's (GNWT Social Services, Fort Simpson) opinion that the pipeline has had few if any effects on social assistance recipients in Fort Simpson.

3.4.6 Wrigley

Social assistance statistics have fluctuated annually in Wrigley. Over a longer period of time trends may be seen. Total expenditure increased from $10,815 in 1977/78 to $15,895 in 1982/83 and $19,133 in 1983/84 while total case-months had returned to the 1977/78 level of 75. "Economic" case-months have fluctuated in an upward trend, expenditure levels followed accordingly. In 1983/84 "economic" expenditure and case-months were $9,791 and 35 respectively, an increase from $5,251 and 25 in 1982/83. "Dependent children" statistics declined to $1,485 and 5 case-months in 1983/84. None of the fluctuations can be proven to be related to the Norman Wells construction. Social assistance was to have decreased in response to employment generated by right of way clearing beginning in January 1983 (Drake) but it is not reflected in the data.

3.4.7 Fort Norman

Social assistance in Fort Norman has been declining since a record high in 1980/81 ($51,586 and 152 case-months). Statistics for 1983/84 are the lowest of the study period ($31,856 and 86 case-months). "Economic" assistance fluctuated throughout the period then decreased in 1982/83 and maintained that level in 1983/84 ($10,387 and 34 case-months). Case-months of dependent children stabilized at 50 for 1980/81. 1981/82 and 1982/83 then decreased to 27 in 1983/84. None of these fluctuations can be proven to be caused by Norman Wells construction activity.

3.4.8 Norman Wells

Norman Wells has the lowest case-month and expenditure levels of any of the communities studied. People receiving assistance rarely compose more than one percent of the community population (Table 3.11). The number of case-months has remained relatively stable, averaging less than 3 cases per month and fluctuating little. The only exception is 1979/80 when there were only 4 cases in the entire fiscal year. Since then expenditure has increased strongly. For example, in 1983/84 expenditure was double that of the previous year although there were fewer case-months. The number of case-months for dependent children and economic reasons were very low (five or less) until 1979/80. Following a peak in 1980/81, the monthly caseload for reason of dependent children was zero until the last three months of fiscal year 1983/84 when it increased to 2. Expenditure in these 3 months surpassed that of the peak year in 1980/81. Economic case-months decreased by half in 1983/84

Table 3.11

Persons Receiving Social Assistance as a Percentage of Community Population*

Center	1978/79		1979/80		1980/81		1981/82		1982/83		1983/84	
	July	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.
Fort Simpson	8	10	7	12	12	12	7	7	9	12	6	8
Wrigley	11	10	6	17	2	7	20	12	8	14	5	11
Fort Norman	9	16	14	12	4	24	15	21	15	13	5	13
Norman Wells	2	<1	0	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	1	2
Fort Good Hope	30	8	27	35	27	33	34	35	30	35	33	40
Trout Lake	6	0	0	18	17	19	27	22	15	15	10	23

* Community population statistics correspond to June of the Fiscal year.

Source: Minister's Report. GNWT Department of Social Services.
GNWT Bureau of Statistics.

to 14; the majority of the decrease came from the insufficient income category. Perhaps this decrease and the increased caseload for dependent children may be attributable to Norman Wells construction.

3.5 Summary and Conclusion

The number of case-months and expenditure of social assistance by fiscal year as reported in the Minister's Report are the best social assistance monitors available.

Limitations of these and other social assistance statistics are listed in Table 3.12. In general, total expenditure has increased and the number of case-months has levelled off or decreased. "Economic reasons" have increased in relative importance as the number of case-months for this category has generally increased (except Fort Norman and Norman Wells in 1983/84) and the "dependent children" category has decreased (except Norman Wells in 1983/84). Further documentation of social assistance data is necessary to determine if changes in the variables in 1983/84 may be attributed to Norman Wells construction.

In spite of these limitations, the reader should keep in mind that (1) social data by communities is only available as a consequence of public programs being delivered at the community level, (2) these data are available for the administrative regions and at the territorial level (as well as at the community level) and this fact permits comparisons of territorial and regional trends over time within community trends.

Table 3.12

Limitations of the Social Assistance Data

Print Outs by Social Services	Chief Limitations
	Limitations common to all data forms are:
1. Minister's Report Social assistance by reason, amount expenditure, number of cases and number of persons.	- not designed for socio-economic monitoring. - attitudes of the social worker affect caseload and assistance levels.
2. Social Assistance Need Amount Report. Type of need by dollars, number of cases, statistics month and usual residence location for the fiscal year.	- increase in assistance payments and changes in qualifiers over time. - basic needs do not change with socio-economic conditions.
3. Social Assistance Incomes Report. Source of income by dollars, number of cases, statistical month and residence location.	- not easily used as an indicator of change.
4. Ad-hoc reports. Any combination of information stored on the computer.	

4. CHILD WELFARE

The quality of family life in northern communities is a major concern. Some argue that the quality of family life is deteriorating as the development of the north proceeds and that rapid industrial development, such as the Norman Wells Project, accelerates this decline, particularly among the native population. Child neglect, physical abuse and alcohol abuse are major problems.

Although the administrative records of the GNWT Social Services record the reason for the child's admission to care or supervision (e.g., parental neglect, parental abuse, parental alcohol abuse), they cannot be used to conclusively indicate the quality of family life. Generally only the most severe cases are brought to the attention of the child welfare worker. The availability of a child welfare worker in a community and the worker's attitude may also affect the caseload. The error inherent in these statistics necessitates that they be used with extreme caution to indicate general levels of child welfare only (Lynn Hall, Child Welfare Summer Research Student, GNWT Social Services). The inherent error and short time span (twenty-two months at most) precludes the suggestion of general trends over long periods. As a result, these data cannot prove or disprove the hypothesis that quality of family life decreases as development increases. Also, the broad and complex concept of "development" (or modernization) which includes all the features brought into the North since European man first appeared is beyond the capacity of these records. Determination of this hypothesis is a

desirable goal but such a major investigation would require additional information to the records to Social Services.

4.1 Contact Person

Sheldon Nider

Planner, Information Systems
Resource Development Policy
Policy, Planning and Support Services
GNWT Department of Social Services
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

(404) 873-7155

4.2 Data Collection

The local child welfare worker completes an intake form (on admission to care) or an update form (to document subsequent changes in the child's status) and sends copies to the regional and Yellowknife offices. The data collected includes school status, legal status, reason for admission to care or supervision, current living arrangements, whereabouts, status and age of parents, and worker's plan for child. The full range of information can be seen in Table 4.1, the intake form for children admitted to care of supervision by a Social Services worker. This information is entered into the computer in Yellowknife (according to the child's Health Care Plan number) and computer data output is produced in the formats described in the following section. This printouts are normally produced monthly which allows the examination of seasonal variation and aggregation of annual totals.

Table 4.1

Northwest Territories

SOCIAL SERVICES

INTAKE FORM-CHILDREN ADMITTED TO CARE OR SUPERVISION

1 SURNAME | GIVEN NAMES | 2 DATE OF CURRENT ADMISSION d m y | 3 HEALTH CARE NO.

4 ALSO KNOWN AS | HOME SETTLEMENT CODE

5 NAME

PLACEMENT ADDRESS — ADDRESS | SETTLEMENT CODE

6 SCHOOL STATUS
1 ☐ ATTENDS REGULARLY
2 ☐ IRREGULAR ATTENDANCE
3 ☐ DROP-OUT
4 ☐ EXPELLED
5 ☐ SPECIAL PROGRAM
6 ☐ OTHER

7 DATE OF BIRTH d m y

8 SEX M 1 ☐ F 2 ☐

9 ETHNIC ORIGIN
1 ☐ INDIAN
2 ☐ METIS
3 ☐ INUK
4 ☐ OTHER

10 LEGAL STATUS
1 ☐ APPREHENSION
2 ☐ SEC. 19 (2)(a) SUPERVISION
3 ☐ TEMPORARY WARD (C.W.O.)
4 ☐ PERMANENT WARD
5 ☐ TEMPORARY WARD (J.D.A.)
6 ☐ JUVENILE PROBATION
7 ☐ NON-WARD CARE
EXPECTED EXPIRY DATE d m y

11 CHECK (✓) THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR THE CHILD'S ADMISSION TO CARE OR SUPERVISION

01 ☐ CHILD'S PHYSICAL HANDICAP
02 ☐ CHILD'S MENTAL RETARDATION
03 ☐ CHILD'S EMOTIONAL OR BEHAVIORAL PROBLEM
04 ☐ CHILD IN CONFLICT WITH THE LAW
05 ☐ PARENTAL ABUSE OF CHILD
06 ☐ PARENTAL NEGLECT OF CHILD
07 ☐ PARENT SURRENDERED CHILD FOR ADOPTION
08 ☐ ILLNESS OR PHYSICAL DISABILITY OF PARENT(S)
09 ☐ EMOTIONAL PROBLEM OR MENTAL ILLNESS OF PARENT(S)
10 ☐ PARENT UNABLE TO SUPERVISE CHILD
11 ☐ FINANCIAL NEED AND/OR INADEQUATE HOUSING
12 ☐ DEATH OF PARENT
13 ☐ ALCOHOL ABUSE BY PARENT

12 CHILD'S LIVING ARRANGEMENT AT TIME OF CURRENT ADMISSION
1 ☐ WITH PARENT AND/OR SIBLINGS
2 ☐ WITH GRANDPARENTS OR OTHER RELATIVES
3 ☐ LIVING WITH ADULT NON-RELATIVES
4 ☐ OTHER (Specify) _____

13 NUMER OF SIBLINGS

14 CHILD'S PARENTS

14.1 WHEREABOUTS

	MOTHER	FATHER
AT HOME	1 ☐	1 ☐
HOSPITAL OR OTHER INSTITUTION	2 ☐	2 ☐
LIVING WITH ANOTHER SPOUSE	3 ☐	3 ☐
OTHER LIVING ARRANGEMENT	4 ☐	4 ☐
DECEASED	5 ☐	5 ☐
UNKNOWN	8 ☐	8 ☐

14.2 STATUS OF PARENT

	MOTHER	FATHER
NATURAL PARENT	1 ☐	1 ☐
ADOPTIVE PARENT	2 ☐	2 ☐
COMMON-LAW PARENT	3 ☐	3 ☐

14.3 PARENT'S AGE AT CHILD'S CURRENT ADMISSION TO CARE OR SUPERVISION

	MOTHER	FATHER
UNDER 21	1 ☐	1 ☐
21-30	2 ☐	2 ☐
31-40	3 ☐	3 ☐
41-50	4 ☐	4 ☐
OVER 50	5 ☐	5 ☐

15 CURRENT PLACEMENT RESOURCE

01 ☐ PARENT(S) CARE
02 ☐ FREE FOSTER HOME
03 ☐ FOSTER HOME
04 ☐ GROUP HOME
05 ☐ RECEIVING HOME
☐ PORT SMITH CENTRE
☐ OWN RESOURCE
☐ ABSENT WITHOUT PERMISSION
☐ NON-D.S.S.
☐ ADOPTION HOME

4.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation

4.3.1 Number of days and cases in care by type of care, most recent placement, location and month.

The number of days and cases in care in the Fort Smith Region in August 1982 is shown in Table 4.2. Data from December 1981 to September 1983 is useful because it has been reliably audited. It is available for the four study communities.

Eleven types of care are listed: parental care, free foster home (e.g., supplied by a friend of the family), foster home, group home, receiving home, Fort Smith Centre, own resource (parent finds facility), absent without permission, non-Department of Social Services, institutional care and adoption home.

Evaluation. This data format is the most useful available because it is broken down at the community level and lists the number of days and cases in care. The number of cases is the best variable for study. Number of days in care is a function of the number of cases but tends to be more variable (number of days per case varied from 1 to 30) and exaggerate changes.

Although home community is not specified, one can assume that it is the placement location in the majority of cases, due to the practice of keeping the child in the home community if at all possible. This is done in recognition of the strength and significance of family ties in even the most desperate families and the importance of placing children in homes with a language and cultural background similar to their own (Family and Child Care Services Manual, September 1978). Movement is often to facilities not found in the home community.

Table 4.2

Child Welfare by Days and Cases in Care
for Communities in the Fort Smith Region
in August 1982

Type of Care	Fort Simpson		Fort Wrigley		Total	
	Days	Cases	Days	Cases	Days	Cases
Parent(s)' care	227	8	31	1	1,189	42
Free Foster Home	0	0	0	0	62	2
Foster Home	144	8	31	1	1,201	44
Group Home	93	3	0	0	585	20
Receiving Home	0	0	0	0	217	7
Fort Smith Centre	0	0	0	0	207	7
Own Resource	0	0	0	0	93	3
Absent without permission	0	0	0	0	31	1
Non D.S.S. Institutional Care	0	0	0	0	275	9
Adoption Home	0	0	0	0	62	2
Other	0	0	0	0	231	8
Total	464	19	0	0	4,153	145

Other errors may arise from:

1. the changing of a child's name as they go to live with their grandparents or other family.
2. a child welfare worker's assignment of a new health care number to a child without checking for a previously assigned number.
3. the computer distinguishing phonetically equivalent names as different people. This error is less a problem in the Mackenzie Basin as names are more "recognizable" than those of the Eastern Arctic.
4. the number of social workers and their attitudes.
5. the availability and use of preventative family counselling.
6. field officers marking the category "other" more often than necessary (as indicated by the specifics added on the form). This would cause categories such as the reasons for admission to be less accurate.

Errors (1) to (3) could significantly affect the total time a child was reported to be under care and the total number of children reported to be receiving care in a time period. Fortunately, the number of active cases at a particular point in time is the variable of interest.

All of the child welfare data forms described in this report are subject to these errors. The importance of auditing is clearly indicated.

The short time period for which reliable data is available limits the use of fiscal year totals to 1982 and 1984. While these child welfare figures have the potential of serving as a social indicator of family wellbeing in communities, the data may not serve this function well. Further discussions are necessary with Social Services officials.

4.3.2 Reason for admission by admission age groups, supervising area office and month.

Age groups are 0 to 5, 6 to 11 and 12 to 18 years of age. The single most important reason for admission may be identified as child's physical handicap, child's mental retardation, child's emotional or behavioural problem, child in conflict with the law, parental abuse of the child, parental neglect of the child, parental surrender of the child for adoption, illness or physical disability of parent(s), emotional problem or mental illness of parent(s), parent unable to supervise child, financial need and/or inadequate housing, death of parent or alcohol abuse by parent.

Data Availability. The smallest administrative units for which these admission figures are available is the Area. Even at this macro level, the number of cases is very small (see Table 4.3). The two administrative Areas containing the four study communities are the South Inuvik Area and the Fort Simpson Area. The footnote on page 50 provides a list of the communities found in each Area.

The May 1982 admission data for the Fort Smith Region and the Fort Simpson Area are shown in Table 4.4. Data are available for the time period December 1981 to January 1983 only.

Evaluation. Admission statistics for children are useful for indicating change in family well-being. However the limitations of the data may prevent its use because (1) data is not given by community but to supervising area, and (2) reliable data are only available since December 1981.

Table 4.3

Reasons for Admission by Admission Age Groups,
Fort Simpson Area, May 31, 1982
Number of Cases in Each Age Group*

Reason for Admissions	0-5	6-11	12-18	Unknown	Total
Handicap	0	0	0	0	0
Retardation	0	0	0	0	0
Behavioral Problem	0	0	1	0	1
Conflict with the Law	0	0	14	1	15
Parent Abuse	0	0	0	0	0
Parent Neglect	2	2	0	0	4
Adoption	2	0	0	0	2
Disabled Parent	0	0	1	0	1
Emotion/Parent	0	0	0	0	0
Can't Supervise	0	2	3	0	5
Financial Need	0	0	0	0	0
Death of Parent	0	0	0	0	0
Alcohol Abuse	1	0	0	0	1
Total	5	4	19	1	29

* Source: Department of Social Services, Child Welfare Information System.

4.3.3 Legal status by current age groups, supervising area office and month.

Legal status is available for the Fort Smith Region and supervising areas and not by communities. Data are available from September 1982 to June 1983.

Seven types of legal status are (1) apprehension, (2) Section 19(2a), (3) temporary ward (by Child Welfare Ordinance and Juvenile Delinquent Act), (4) permanent ward, (5) temporary ward, (6) juvenile probation, and (7) non-ward care. Non-ward care is a voluntary contractual agreement with the parents for the Department of Social Services to take care of the child, usually during the short term crisis (e.g., parent hospitalization), or to provide services for the child that could not otherwise be provided. The information is organized by age groups: 0 to 5, 6 to 11, and 12 to 18 years.

Evaluation. This data does have some use for socio-economic monitoring because its subject matter deals with family well-being. The major drawbacks are: its time frame is too short for indicating change over time and these data are not readily available by communities.

4.3.4 Cross tabulation of cases by legal status and care plan type month by month, region and total NWT.

The categories of legal status considered include the seven listed in Item 4.3.3 above as well as "no child welfare status". The latter category covers expenditures on behalf of a child not under care. A child welfare worker may plan any of the following ten types of care for the child: (1) return of the child to parental care, (2) permanent foster care, (3) adoption, (4) long term institutional care, (5)

treatment programs, (6) health care or therapy, (7) education or employment, (8) rehabilitation, (9) uncertain, and (10) other.

This data is available for the administrative regions and the NWT from January 1982 to September 1983. Community level data is not currently produced as a printout.

Evaluation. This cross tabulation provides an overview of child welfare in the regions and NWT. The rate of "return to parents" may be of some use as an indicator of social change/family well being.

4.3.5 Data forms which list child welfare cases by name are prepared but are not available to the public:*

1. child welfare cases by name, supervising area office and month,
2. child welfare cases by name, placement location, home region and type of care,
3. inter-area regional case movement by name and month,
4. total number of days in care by name, placement location and month,
5. juvenile delinquents by name, home region, placement locations and type of care,
6. threshold reports,
   (a) child welfare cases institutionalized for more than one year,
   (b) child welfare cases which have moved more than four times in the past six months,
   (c) quarterly progress reports,
   (d) children ready for adoption.

---

*Information containing the recipient's name is not available to the public but the aggregated statistics, such as the number of recipients by area office and month could be prepared as a special "run".

Threshold reports consist of the children's names, supervising region, home community, reason for admission, legal status and type of care. These monthly issues are reminders to the field officers to prepare evaluation reports of each child listed.

Evaluation. Such listings of social information for children by name does not contribute new information (except for the name). Accordingly, no use of this information is planned for the Norman Wells monitoring program.

4.4 Assessment and Analysis

The data collected on the child's intake form provide a wide assortment of information, some of which could provide an indication of social change in the community. Several problems exist. These are: (1) the short time period of the data, (2) the limited number of categories listed on the intake form, (3) the need to interpret these general classes of information, (4) variations in interpretation of these coded classes by social workers, and (5) the difficulty of knowing sufficient information about the parents to correctly state the reason for admitting the child into state care or supervision. Another factor may be that small communities like Wrigley have no resident social workers. This may affect the delivery of social programs and services to such a community and thereby bias the quantitative data.

An analysis of the data is presented by regional units, beginning with the Northwest Territories. This allows the reader to see if the broad spatial trends exist at the community level.

4.4.1 Northwest Territories

The total number of children in-care (excluding those without child welfare status) remained stable or decreased slightly during 1982-83 (two year average = 468). The predominant reason for admission is conflict with the law followed by parental neglect. Most children in conflict with the law are 12 to 18 years of age whereas those suffering parental neglect are usually 6 to 11 years old. Alcohol abuse and parental abuse as reasons for instituting care are comparatively low.

4.4.2 Fort Simpson and Fort Smith Region

The number of children in care increased in the administrative area of Fort Simpson and the Fort Smith Region in May 1982 is shown in Table 4.4. Like the NWT, conflict with the law, cannot supervise and parental neglect are the most important reasons for admission. Admissions due to alcohol abuse were very low in Fort Simpson Area and in the Fort Smith Region. This fact may not necessarily be a true indication of the role of alcohol abuse in child welfare cases.

4.4.3 Fort Simpson and Wrigley

Overall, the number of child welfare cases was quite stable in Fort Simpson and Wrigley. On average Fort Simpson had 19 cases per month. This level decreased slightly from June 1983 to September 1983. It is unknown if this "trend" continued but there has been no increase in "reported" child neglect or child assistance during the period of pipeline construction.

There were three child welfare cases in Wrigley on average. A slight increasing "trend" may have begun at the end of the study period.

Table 4.4

Ranked Reasons for Admission to Child Welfare
(Fort Simpson Area, May 31, 1982)

Rank	Admission Reason	Number of Children Admitted
1	Conflict with the Law	15 (47)
2	Cannot Supervise	5 (16)
3	Parental Neglect	4 (36)
4	Adoption	2 (5)
5	Disabled Parent	1 (1)
5	Behavioral Problem	1 (12)
5	Alcohol Abuse	1 (4)
Total		29 (121)*

* Figures in brackets are for the Fort Smith Region which includes the Fort Simpson area. The Fort Smith Region had a total of 137 cases.

SOURCE: Social Services, Child Welfare Information System.

4.4.4 Norman Wells and Fort Norman

Norman Wells and Fort Norman remained at very low case levels (1 and 0 respectively) for the majority of the time period studied. The small increases beginning in April 1983 and July 1983 respectively cannot be considered significant.

4.5 Youth Camp Program

A summer wilderness camp for youth ages 9 to 17 years has been operating out of Fort Simpson since 1982. The purpose of the program is to keep the young people from "running loose" in the summer when their parents are working. Each year attendance has increased: less than 10 in 1982, 25 in 1983, and 40 in 1984 (Will Drake, Social Services, Fort Simpson). This increase is probably due to growing parental confidence in the program than increasing participation in the wage economy stimulated by pipeline construction (Drake).

4.6 Summary and Conclusion

The high number of children in conflict with the law suggests a lack of parental control. Parental neglect is also high, particularly in the 6 to 11 year age group. Seldom was alcohol abuse or physical abuse the primary reason for placing the child in state care.

The well-being of the family and its members is of importance to community life and maintenance of culture and identity. Child welfare data is only one measure of family well-being. It is not an indicator of the stability of northern family life in a community because it only

deals with a small proportion of the population. Limitations of the data are listed in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

Overview of Chief Limitations of the Data Considered

	Date Type	Limitations
1.	location and month	- home community is assumed to be placement location.
2.	Reason for admission by age groups, supervising area office and month	- data is by supervising area office. - field officers marking the category "other" more often necessary could affect reason values
3.	Legal status by current age groups, supervising area office and month	- not a useful for for socio-economic monitoring. - time period too short.
4.	Cross tabulation of cases by legal status and care plan type by month, region and total NWT	- an overview only.
5.	Child welfare case by name and other information	- cumbersome - no new or useful information
Factors effecting child welfare levels in all data forms are:		- the number and attitude of social workers, - the availability and use of family counselling.

5. SERVICES TO THE AGED

Care of the aged is a concern throughout society. In traditional native culture, the able-bodied aged were respected and had a role in the family. With the population boom of the 1960s and 1970s, overcrowding of the large family groups in small dwellings became a problem. It is speculated that the aged may be neglected because (1) overcrowding in housing, (2) the demise of their traditional family role, and (3) the growth of a nuclear family unit. A demand for senior citizens homes has occurred, a reflecting a shift in values towards the elderly by their family and the community.

5.1 Contact Persons

Kelly Da Corte

Financial Administration
GNWT Social Services
Yellowknife, NWT

(404) 873-7459

Sheldon Nider

Planner, Information Systems,
GNWT Social Services
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

(404) 873-7155

5.2 Data Collection

People eligible for the combined federal Old Age Supplement and Guaranteed Income Supplement or Spouses Allowance are also eligible for the Territorial Senior Citizens Supplement. Federal records of recipients in the NWT are sent monthly to the GNWT. Senior Citizens Supplementary Benefits are then automatically issued from Yellowknife to those listed.

5.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation

5.3.1 Senior Citizens Supplementary Benefits by number of active cases (and new and dropped cases), settlement and region for a twelve month period.

The value of the benefits by communities in thee Fort Smith Region are available from April 1978 to July 1983.

Evaluation. The data consist of the number of senior citizens receiving supplementary benefits. The data is accurate and has appropriate community breakdown. While it is of use as a socio-economic indicator, the people represented by the data are not part of the potential workforce: their income (and need for income supplements) should not change with increased economic activity. Natural causes—aging and death—are the major reasons for the fluctuation in the number of active cases.

5.4 Northern Communities and the Aged

Senior citizens were identified by Will Drake (Social Services, Fort Simpson) as being one of the age groups of greatest need in Fort Simpson. These needs have arisen from the natural aging of people in the area, not neglect by families involved in the wage economy (Pat Selhaver, Coordinator, Aged and Handicapped, GNWT Social Services). The people of Wrigley are more involved with the land, consequently older people remain more active (Drake). Norman Wells is a young community so there is no problem (Selhaver).

Fort Simpson's social services program is attempting to meet the needs of their senior citizens with "homemakers", income supplements, and accommodation. Plans for cottage style senior citizens homes to replace the existing apartments have met favourable response (Drake).

5.5 Summary and Conclusion

Any increased demand for services for senior citizens has been due to an aging population rather than neglect by families involved in the wage economy. The number of people receiving the territorial Senior Citizens Supplement cannot be used as an indicator for the reasons listed in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1

Data Limitation

Data Type	Chief Limitations
The number of active cases receiving the Senior Citizens Supplement.	- change in the number of active cases is due to natural aging processes rather than socio-economic changes.

6. ALCOHOL ABUSE AND RELATED SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Northern natives now live in organized settlements and are faced with making a new life for themselves with the modern economy. These major social adjustments are taking place within the context of rapid modernization.

Small native communities generally do not have sufficient employment opportunities for young people and few appear interested in the bush life. Drinking, solvent sniffing and petty crimes may offer a release from the lack of direction in their lives. Although those who abuse alcohol and drugs and commit crime may receive treatment and spend time in the territorial correction centers, many are not able to permanently break these harmful habits. Physical abuse of wives and children and violent deaths are reportedly more common occurrences in native communities than in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, there is no documented report which demonstrate this relationship. In this section, the appropriate GNWT figures on crime, alcohol abuse and suicide are presented.

Alcohol consumption in the NWT is rising. Figures from the GNWT Liquor Control System and Liquor Licencing Board suggest 20% increase in the total volume of liquor sold from 1974/75 to 1982/83. Population figures over the same period increased only marginally. Similarly the value of liquor sales is now above $20 million each year. At Norman Wells, the value of sales rose from $489,000 in 1981/82 (before the Norman Wells Project began) to $902,000 in 1982/83 (the first year of

the Norman Wells Project). Tables 6.1 and 6.2 reflect the increase in alcohol consumption.

6.1 Contact Person

Sheldon Nider

Planner, Information Systems
Resource Development Policy
Policy, Planning and Support Services
GNWT Department of Social Services
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2L9

(403) 873-7155

6.2 Data Collection

Intake and release (closure) forms are completed by correction officers (for inmates, Tables 6.3 and 6.4) and probation officers (for probationers and parolees, Tables 6.5 and 6.6). Copies of these forms are sent to the office to Yellowknife where the data is entered on the computer. Perhaps the most important facts are the type of offense, related problems (alcohol and drugs) and employment information.

Table 6.1

Total Volume of Liquor Sold in the NWT
(gallons)

	Spirits	Wine	Beer	Total	Absolute Alcohol
1974/75	96,732	57,700	652,161	806,593	78,413
1975/76	99,488	48,000	738,148	885,636	81,724
1976/77	109,743	48,452	738,236	896,431	86,139
1977/78	106,990	56,905	742,186	906,081	56,164
1978/79	107,641	56,093	671,797	835,531	82,816
1979/80	104,319	56,498	661,070	821,887	80,995
1980/81	111,304	54,942	712,539	878,785	86,193
1981/82	120,571	56,661	752,843	930,075	92,103
1982/83	124,783	61,697	792,586	969,168	96,329

Source: GNWT Liquor Control System and Liquor Licencing Board. Annual Report. 1975 to 1983.

Table 6.2

Value of Liquor Sales
(dollars)

	Norman Wells Store	Fort Simpson Store	Total NWT
1967/68	85,146	16,333	—
1968/69	101,448	133,097	3,981,842
1969/70	141,454	166,129	4,783,210
1970/71	139,491	221,642	5,589,192
1971/72	190,671	295,889	6,509,583
1972/73	223,518	415,401	7,496,179
1973/74	288,633	551,715	8,704,012
1974/75	301,305	539,443	9,574,266
1975/76	347,434	608,808	10,981,708
1976/77	348,868	605,059	11,280,747
1977/78	355,167	596,349	12,150,944
1978/79	--	--	12,783,114
1979/80	383,199	707,906	13,379,588
1980/81	405,894	716,009	15,184,548
1981/82	487,000	549,000	17,750,366
1982/83	902,000	625,000	20,199,370

— = data not available.

Source: GNWT Liquor Control System and Liquor Licencing Board. Annual Report. 1968 to 1983.

Table 6.3

INTAKE FORM

T.C.C. COPY

Northwest Territories

TERRITORIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

IDENTITY

INMATE NUMBER | DATE ADMITTED (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | SURNAME | GIVEN NAMES | SEX (1 MALE, 2 FEMALE)

ALIAS – SURNAME | GIVEN NAMES | AGE | DATE OF BIRTH (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | ETHNIC ORIGIN (1. INDIAN 3. METIS 2. INUK 4. OTHER)

USUAL RESIDENCE ADDRESS | TERR. OR PROV. | SETTL. CODE

HEALTH CARE PLAN No. | CONDITION: PHYSICAL | MEDICAL

HEIGHT | WEIGHT | BUILD | EYES (COLOR) | HAIR (COLOR) | VISIBLE MARKS

COMPLEXION

PLACE OF BIRTH | RELIGION | NEXT OF KIN | PHONE

CITIZENSHIP ☐ CANADIAN ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY) | DATE OF ENTRY | ADDRESS

OFFENCE

OFFENCE/SENTENCE DATA

No. of Charges	OFFENCE CODE	DESCRIPTION	SENTENCE LENGTH MONTHS OR DAYS	Cons Conc	SENT TYPE

LOCATION WHERE OFFENCE(S) OCCURRED | SETTL. CODE

COMMENTS:

ADMISSION

No. of Warrants | WARRANT EXECUTION DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | WARRANT EXPIRY DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | AGGREGATE SENTENCE LENGTH DAYS | CALC BY | DAYS PER WEEK – IF ON INTERMITTENT SENTENCE

SECURITY ASSESSMENT (1 MINIMUM, 2 MEDIUM, 3 MAXIMUM)

PREVIOUS INCARCERATIONS: T.C.C. | FED. PEN.

TYPE OF WARRANT(S) – (X ONE ONLY): 1 SENTENCE 2 REMAND 3 PAROLE SUSPENSION 4 OTHER SPECIFY

IF FINE DEFAULT ENTER AMOUNT OF FINE(S) $ .00

IF TRANSFERRED IN FROM NON-DEPARTMENTAL CUSTODY THEN TRANSFERRED IN FROM: 1 FED PEN 2 PROV C.C 3 R.C.M.P LOCK-UP 4 OTHER | LOCATION | CODE

TYPE OF COURT: 1 TERRITORIAL 2 SUPREME 3 COURT OF APPEAL 4 JUSTICE OF THE PEACE 5 OTHER

LOCATION OF COURT | SETTL. CODE

PERSONAL AND BACKGROUND

SOCIAL INSURANCE NUMBER (IF KNOWN) | F.P.S. NUMBER (IF KNOWN)

NUMBER OF DEPENDANTS ▶ | LEVEL OF EDUCATION ▶

MARITAL STATUS: 1 SINGLE 2 MARRIED 3 DIVORCED 4 SEPARATED 5 WIDOWED

USUAL LIVING ARRANGEMENT: 1 WITH SPOUSE AND/OR CHILDREN 2 WITH PARENTS, FRIENDS OR RELATIVES 3 ALONE, IN FIXED ABODE 4 ALONE, NO FIXED ABODE 5 OTHER

EMPLOYED: (AT TIME OF APPREHENSION) 1 FULL TIME 2 PART TIME 3 SEASONALLY 4 PERIODICALLY 5 NOT AT ALL

USUAL OCCUPATION: 1 TRAPPER/HUNTER/FISHERMAN 2 HANDICRAFTS 3 SERVICE 4 GENERAL LABOUR 5 TRADE/TECHNICAL 6 CLERICAL/PROFESSIONAL 7 HOMEMAKER 8 STUDENT 9 NO SKILLS 10 OTHER

TRAINING: 1 VOCATIONAL 2 APPRENTICE 3 ADULT EDUCATION

OFFENCE AND/OR INTAKE RELATED PROBLEMS: (X ALL THAT APPLY) ▶ ☐ ALCOHOL ☐ DRUGS ☐ VIOLENCE ☐ PROPERTY ☐ FIRST OFFENDER ☐ OTHER

PERSONAL EFFECTS

$ | PERSONAL EFFECTS:

Table 6.4

CLOSURE FORM

T.C.C. COPY

Northwest Territories

TERRITORIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

R ☐ REPLACE

INMATE NUMBER	SURNAME	GIVEN NAMES	CLOSURE DATE DAY / MONTH / YEAR

HEALTH CARE PLAN No	REMISSION DAYS EARNED	REMISSION DAYS FORFEITED	No OF ESCAPES	No OF UNSUCCESSFUL TEMPORARY ABSENCES	DISCIPLINARY INFRACTIONS
					1 ☐ NONE 2 ☐ 1 TO 3 3 ☐ 4 TO 10 4 ☐ OVER 10

REASON FOR CLOSURE (X ONE ONLY)

1 ☐ SENTENCE EXPIRED	7 ☐ TRANSFERRED TO FEDERAL PENITENTIARY	PROV	12 ☐ REMAND EXPIRED – REMAINING ON SENTENCE
2 ☐ REMAND RELEASE	8 ☐ TRANSFERRED TO PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL CENTRE	PROV	13 ☐ SENTENCE EXPIRED – REMAINING ON REMAND
3 ☐ FINE PAID	9 ☐ DISCHARGED TO PROBATION	REGION CODE	14 ☐ PAROLE SUSPENSION EXPIRED – RELEASED
4 ☐ EARLY RELEASE	10 ☐ CONVICTION QUASHED OR APPEALED		15 ☐ PAROLE SUSPENSION EXPIRED PAROLE REVOKED
5 ☐ PAROLED	11 ☐ ESCAPE		16 ☐ OTHER SPECIFY
6 ☐ MANDATORY SUPERVISION			

SOCIAL INSURANCE No (IF KNOWN)	F P S NUMBER (IF KNOWN)	CASH ON DISCHARGE	COMMENTS
		$	

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES UTILIZED (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION	☐ ALCOHOL TREATMENT	☐ HALFWAY HOUSE PLACEMENT	☐ OTHER TEMPORARY ABSENCES
☐ VOCATIONAL TRAINING	☐ PSYCHIATRIC COUNSELLING	☐ MEDICAL DENTAL OR OPTICAL TREATMENT	☐ LIFE SKILLS
☐ COUNSELLING	☐ LAND PROGRAM	☐ WORK RELEASE	☐ DAY PAROLE

UNRESOLVED PROBLEM AREAS (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ HOUSING	☐ FAMILY SITUATION	☐ ALCOHOL AND OR DRUGS
☐ EMPLOYMENT	☐ PEER GROUP	☐ MEDICAL
☐ FINANCES	☐ BEHAV OUR	☐ CHARGES OUTSTANDING

REFERRALS (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ SOCIAL SERVICES	☐ PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES	☐ MANPOWER
☐ ALCOHOL TREATMENT	☐ OTHER SPECIFY	

RETURN TO HOME COMMUNITY

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

3 ☐ UNKNOWN

PLANS ON RELEASE

☐ FURTHER EDUCATION	☐ MEDICAL TREATMENT (INCLUDING A A)	☐ NO PLANS	
☐ EMPLOYMENT	☐ HALFWAY HOUSE	☐ UNKNOWN	

TRANSPORTATION PROVIDED TO: CODE ___ LOCATION _____ DATE _____

TRANSPORTATION WAIVED DATE _____ SIGNATURE _____

WITNESS DATE _____ SIGNATURE _____

PROGNOSIS AND OTHER COMMENTS

Northwest Territories

ORIGINATOR'S COPY

1 ☐ PROBATION 2 ☐ PAROLE

PROBATION (& PAROLE) INTAKE FORM

R ☐ REPLACE

FORM DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR)

IDENTIFICATION

HEALTH CARE PLAN No. | INTAKE DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | SURNAME | GIVEN NAMES

ALIAS - SURNAME | GIVEN NAMES | AGE | DATE OF BIRTH (DAY / MONTH / YEAR) | SEX: 1 ☐ MALE 2 ☐ FEMALE

CURRENT ADDRESS | TERR OR PROV | TELEPHONE No | SETTL CODE

USUAL ADDRESS | TERR OR PROV | TELEPHONE No | SETTL CODE

SOCIAL INSURANCE No (IF KNOWN) | F.P.S. No (IF KNOWN) | NAME OF PROV OR TERR TRANSFERRED IN FROM | DISCHARGING INSTITUTION: 1 ☐ TCC ➡ CODE; 2 ☐ FED PEN ➡ PROVINCE | ETHNIC ORIGIN: 1 ☐ INDIAN 3 ☐ METIS 2 ☐ INUK 4 ☐ OTHER

REGIONAL AREA DISTRICT OFFICE | SETTL CODE

PERSONAL

MARITAL STATUS

1 ☐ SINGLE 3 ☐ DIVORCED 5 ☐ WIDOWED

2 ☐ MARRIED 4 ☐ SEPARATED

No. OF DEPENDANTS ➡

LEVEL OF EDUCATION ➡

TRAINING

1 ☐ VOCATIONAL 3 ☐ ADULT EDUCATION

2 ☐ APPRENTICE

LIVING ARRANGEMENT

1 ☐ WITH SPOUSE AND OR CHILDREN 3 ☐ ALONE IN FIXED ABODE 5 ☐ OTHER

2 ☐ WITH PARENTS FRIENDS OR RELATIVES 4 ☐ ALONE NO FIXED ABODE

EMPLOYED AT INTAKE

1 ☐ FULL-TIME 3 ☐ SEASONALLY 5 ☐ NOT AT ALL

2 ☐ PART-TIME 4 ☐ PERIODICALLY

USUAL OCCUPATION TYPE

1 ☐ HUNTER TRAPPER/ FISHERMAN 3 ☐ SERVICE 5 ☐ TRADE/ TECHNICAL 7 ☐ HOMEMAKER 9 ☐ NO SKILLS

2 ☐ HANDICRAFTS 4 ☐ GENERAL LABOUR 6 ☐ CLERICAL/ PROFESSIONAL 8 ☐ STUDENT 10 ☐ OTHER

OFFENCE

REPORT DONE 1 ☐ PSR 2 ☐ CA

TYPE OF COURT 1 ☐ TERRITORIAL 2 ☐ SUPREME 3 ☐ COURT OF APPEAL 4 ☐ JUSTICE OF THE PEACE 5 ☐ OTHER SPECIFY

JUDGE | COURT LOCATION | SETTL CODE

OFFENCE DATA

No. of Charges	OFFENCE CODE	LOCATION WHERE OFFENCE(S) OCCURRED (SETTL CODE)	DESCRIPTION OF OFFENCES

SENTENCE

DISPOSITION DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR)

WITH SUPERVISION (PROBATION) 1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO PSR ONLY*

PAROLE CASE 1 ☐ C.A. ONLY* 2 ☐ PAROLE

EXPECTED EXPIRY DATE (DAY / MONTH / YEAR)

DISPOSITION OF CASE

☐ PROBATION

1 ☐ INCARCERATION

2 ☐ INTERMITTENT SENTENCE

3 ☐ ABSOLUTE DISCHARGE

☐ RESTITUTION AMOUNT $ .00

☐ CSO HOURS OR DAYS

LENGTH OF SENTENCE

INCARCERATION MONTHS OR DAYS

PROBATION MONTHS

ANY OFFENCES ALCOHOL RELATED?

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO 3 ☐ UNKNOWN

AMOUNT OF FINES IF ANY ➡ $ .00

DISPOSITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH PSR RECOMMENDATION 1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO 3 ☐ NOT APPLICABLE

Northwest Territories

PROBATION (& PAROLE) CLOSURE FORM

1 ☐ PROBATION 2 ☐ PAROLE R ☐ REPLACE

HEALTH CARE PLAN No.	SURNAME	GIVEN NAMES	CLOSURE DATE DAY MONTH YEAR
ADDRESS		TERR. OR PROVINCE	SETTL. CODE
SOCIAL INSURANCE No. (IF KNOWN)	F.P.S. No. (IF KNOWN)	APPOINTMENTS PER MONTH ➧	ORIGINATING OFFICE / SETTL. CODE

REASON FOR CLOSURE (X ONE BOX ONLY) SETTL. CODE

1 ☐ TERM EXPIRED

2 ☐ REQUESTED POSITIVE BEHAVIOUR } ORDER ALTERED

3 ☐ REQUESTED NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR } ORDER ALTERED

4 ☐ REVOKED

5 ☐ TRANSFERRED TO OTHER OFFICE WITHIN NWT ➧ LOCATION _____

6 ☐ TRANSFERRED OUT OF TERRITORIES ➧ PROVINCE OR TERRITORY

7 ☐ DEATH

8 ☐ OTHER SPECIFY

FURTHER CONVICTIONS DURING SUPERVISION?

☐ BREACH ☐ TERRITORIAL

☐ FEDERAL OTHER ☐ NONE

COMPLIED WITH CONDITIONS?

☐ YES

☐ NO— VIOLATED PROBATION OFFICER CONDITIONS

☐ NO— VIOLATED COURT CONDITIONS

COURT ACTION RECOMMENDED?

1 ☐ YES

2 ☐ NO

INCARCERATED AT CLOSURE?

1 ☐ NO

2 ☐ YES T.C.C. ➧ TCC CODE ☐

3 ☐ YES P.C.C. OR PENITENTIARY ➧ PROV. OR TERR. ☐

EMPLOYMENT STATUS (IF CHANGED)

1 ☐ FULL TIME 2 ☐ PART-TIME 3 ☐ SEASONALLY 4 ☐ PERIODICALLY 5 ☐ NOT AT ALL

SERVICES UTILIZED (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ VOCATIONAL TRAINING ☐ ALCOHOL TREATMENT ☐ HALF WAY HOUSE ☐ JOB FINDING

☐ COUNSELLING ☐ PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT ☐ LIFE SKILLS

REFERRALS (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ SOCIAL SERVICES ☐ PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES ☐ MANPOWER

☐ ALCOHOL TREATMENT ☐ OTHER SPECIFY

UNRESOLVED PROBLEM AREAS (X ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ HOUSING ☐ FINANCES ☐ PEER GROUP ☐ ALCOHOL AND/OR DRUGS

☐ EMPLOYMENT ☐ FAMILY SITUATION ☐ BEHAVIOUR ☐ MEDICAL

PROGNOSIS & OTHER COMMENTS

6.3 Data Inventory and Evaluation

6.3.1 Sentenced inmates by age group, calendar year, and supervising area. Average, maximum and minimum sentence length in days are also given.

These statistics refer to territorial sentences and do not include inmates having intermittent[1] or life sentences. This exclusion prevents distortion of sentence length statistics of the majority of inmates who are sentenced two years less a day at maximum. Serious remedial acts result in much longer sentences which are usually served in southern federal penitentiaries. Age groups are 1-15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-59, 60-98, and 99 years.

The data are available for the period 1967 to 1983. Table 6.7 contains the 1967 statistics for the Fort Simpson area.

Evaluation. The main drawback of this data is that admissions are given by supervisory area rather than home community. Despite this limitation, it is one of the best data forms available and also has the longest time span. The use of five year totals and averages may eliminate yearly fluctuations and therefore present a more reliable trend line for social deviation, i.e., an indicator of social malaise.

---

[1] Time is served on weekends or days off to allow the offender to maintain employment or training.

Table 6.7

Corrections Information System
Sentenced Intakes by Year and Age
(Fort Simpson Area, 1967)

Age Groups	Number of Admissions	Sentence Length (days)		
		Average	Maximum	Minimum
16	1	42	42	42
17	1	3	3	3
20-24	2	17	30	3
25-29	2	183	183	183
30-34	1	28	28	28
35-39	1	30	30	30
Total for Fort Simpson Area	8	63	183	3

6.3.2 Sentenced intakes by major offense grouping, supervising area, calendar year and average, maximum and minimum sentence length (in days).

Examples of major offence groupings are offences against the person and reputation; offences against the rights of property; offences against public order; sexual offences, public morals and disorderly conduct. Alcohol offences are included in the "ordinance" group and cannot be differentiated.

Table 6.8 contains an example of this data for the Fort Simpson area in 1975. These data are available from 1975 to 1982.

Evaluation. Major offence grouping data is a good indicator of types of problems. Although this data does not report information by community, it is one of the best forms produced by the corrections information system.

6.3.3 Special Report on Territorial Correctional Centers[1] by specified report period (e.g., April 1982 to March 1983)

This report includes the following tables:

1. Inmate population as of March 31 by sentence length groups, ethnic origin (Indian/Metis, Inuit, other), remand and parole suspension.
2. Number of inmate days served on sentence and on remand and parole suspension.
3. Admissions' sentence length by ethnic origin and age groups. Remand and parole suspension are also documented.

---

[1] The territorial corrections centers are:
1. Yellowknife Correctional Center (YCC) in Yellowknife,
2. South Mackenzie Correctional Center (SMCC) in Hay River.
3. N.W.T. Correctional Center for Women in Fort Smith.
4. Baffin Correctional Center (BCC) in Frobisher Bay.

Table 6.8

Corrections Information System
Sentences Intakes by Supervising Area
(Fort Simpson Area, 1975)

Offence Grouping	Number of Admissions	Sentencing Length (Days)		
		Average	Maximum	Minimum
Offences against public order	2	45	59	31
Offences against administration of law and justice	2	23	31	14
Offences against the person and reputation	5	140	191	21
Offences against rights of property	11	132	669	31
Other	1	31	31	31
Other dominion acts	1	181	181	181
Ordinances	6	55	90	30
Area Total:	28	101	669	1

4. Admissions' offence type by ethnic origin and age group, excluding remands and parole suspensions. Offence types listed are against the person, against property, drugs, liquor, motor vehicle, other.

5. Admissions' offence and/or intake related problems by number of cases excluding remands and parole suspension. Problem areas listed are alcohol, drugs, violence, property and first offence.

6. Sentenced inmates discharged during the report period by reason for discharge and average time served (days). Discharge reasons given are sentence expired, fine paid, paroled, penitentiary transfer, other.

7. Projected sentenced inmate population for next three months based on release date and average remission charged.

An example of this Special Report run for all the territorial correction centers for fiscal year 1982/83 is available. Other years could be tabulated on request.

Evaluation. Data by territorial correction centers may be used to indicate general trends over time. These data are available by ethnic origin and age groups. Although there is an attempt to keep inmates in the region in which they live, correctional center data is not necessarily representative of the numbers of sentences issued in the region in which it is located. For example, inmates may be transferred to Yellowknife if the centers in Hay River and Frobisher Bay do not provide sufficient security. Most offenders with sentences longer than two years less a day are sent to penitentiaries in the south. All female inmates stay in the NWT Correctional Center for Women in Fort Smith.

Double counting occurs if an inmate is remanded and later sentenced. Thus, some GNWP records are by the number of admissions within an administrative period while others are by the number of

persons. Both these types of records assist the GNWT measure the size of the program and the volume of work.

The number of offences involving alcohol is much higher than reported in the major grouping (e.g., alcohol is not reported as the major offence in a manslaughter case) and problem area data.

These data by community and area would be most useful for socio-economic monitoring.

6.3.4 Special report on territorial correctional centers' admissions and closures (excluding remands and parole suspensions).

Tables included are:

1. Admissions by type of offence, region of home community, sentence length groups and sex.
2. Closures by original sentence length, reason for closure, average time served, average and percent remission earned, return to home community.

Reasons for closure are marked as sentence expired, fine paid, early release, paroled, probation, transfer out of the NWT, other or unknown.

Statistics for the Yellowknife Correctional Centre are available for 1981 to 1983.

Evaluation. As this data is by territorial correction center, it can only provide general trends at best.

The number of admissions do not necessarily equal the number of inmates recorded in a time period. A person is considered only as one inmate even if they were admitted more than once in a time period. In the information available, number of inmates is given for a point of

time and differs significantly from the number of admissions in a period of time. For example, there were 650 admissions to the Yellowknife Correctional Center in 1982/83 and only 159 inmates as of March 31, 1983. This is explained by the turnover rate resulting from an average sentence length of 219 days in the NWT in 1983. Number of admissions is most generally used as an indicator.

6.3.5 Special report on probation and parole by area, region and total NWT.

This report includes the following tables:

1. Probation and parole intakes during the report period by intake type and length of sentence, sex, ethnic origin, age groups, supervision, major offence grouping, community service order (C.S.O.) Intake types are listed as:

   (a) probation—the offender is supervised while living at home rather than being sent to a correctional center. Only for this category is the length of a sentence given.

   (b) parole/mandatory supervision (MS)—Parole is early release of an inmate with the condition certain rules are kept to the end of a sentence. Mandatory supervision is a release of an inmate because of earned remission (based upon good behavior and participation in prison programs). Supervision and conditions are the same as for parole.

   (c) presentence report (PSR)/community assessment (CA) only—The presentence report is written by a probation officer after a conviction but before sentencing to help the court decide if the person should be on probation. Community assessment reports the local background of an inmate and the chances of success of parole or mandatory supervision.

   The total number of related probation intakes, recidivist probation intakes, pre-sentence reports and community assessments during the period are also reported.

2. Supervised probation and parole caseload at end of report period by intake type and length of sentence, sex, ethnic origin, age groups and community service order.

3. Probation and parole terminations for the report period by reason of termination.

These statistics for the Fort Smith region are available.

Evaluation. This data provides a more detailed outlook than the above special reports because the data is given by area. However it does not monitor the communities and probation and parole are only part of the corrections system.

6.3.3 Probation length study by community, 1981 to 1983.

Probationers are listed by age, usual occupation, employment status at time of intake, education, marital status, living arrangement, court type and days on probation. Average length of probation overall, with and without supervision, with community service order and with restitution are listed. Probationers are also counted in time groupings.

Evaluation. This is the most interesting format available. Unfortunately this report is restricted to a two year time period and only a portion of the corrections system.

An ideal data format would include usual place of residence, employment at the time of intake, usual occupation, age, offense, location of offence, and sentence/probation length for inmates, probationers and parolees and extend over a period of 10 years. It should be noted that the usual place of residence cited by inmates may sometimes be misreported because they do not want people to know where they really live (Stan Mounsey, Chief of Corrections, GNWT Social Services).

Reports Available. An unpublished social services reported (released within the department March 1982) analyzed corrections data

with regard to offenders and their offences in the NWT for a 15 and 4 year time span respectively. Number of admissions, drinking and driving offences, sentence length, age at time of admission, type of offence, total yearly inmate days, ethnicity and sex were regarded in absolute and relative terms and expressed graphically.

6.4 Assessment and Analyses

Alcohol is involved in approximately 85 to 95 percent of all legal offences (Corporal R.G.J. Lamabe, Operational Statistics Recording System, RCMP "G" Division, Yellowknife). It follows that there is a close relationship between corrections and alcohol abuse. In turn, some believe that alcohol abuse increases with the following factors:

1. extreme stress (e.g., working and living in "white" dominated communities).
2. large cash income enables the purchase of alcohol.
3. boredom due to lack of employment. This is particularly acute among the young in the smaller communities.

Even after incarceration and counselling, strong family/community ties and the attitude that drinking is "to get drunk" make it difficult for a native to break out of this alcohol-offence-correction cycle. Consequently there is a high rate of recidivism (repeated incarcerations).

Judges also have a role in determining the number of offenders sentenced and sentence length and hence number of inmates at a given time. For example, some judges may give long sentences while others may

give shorter ones for the same offence. In 1981 and 1982 respectively, sentence length increased 17 and 46 percent and the number of admission increased 2 and 23 percent. The number of inmates was also to have increased 40 percent (Mounsey, Chief Corrections, Social Services).

6.4.1 Northwest Territories

The average sentence length and number of admissions in the NWT have been on an upward trend. The peak in 1982 was followed by a decrease of 6 percent in average sentence length (219 days) and 9 percent in admissions (785) in 1983. The cause (e.g., longer sentences issued) and significance of this decrease is not yet known.

At least half of all admissions are 24 years of age or younger (this rose to 63 percent in 1982 and 1983). Although admissions in all age groups have increased since 1967, the less than 18 year category has proportionately increased the most (over 250 percent) and the 24 years of age or older category the least (157 percent).

In fiscal year 1982/83, ethnic breakdown of admissions were as follows:

	Number	Percent Total
Indian/Metis	506	48
Inuit	354	33
Other	202	19
Total	1,062	100

Although admissions per capita were higher in the NWT (15/1,000)[1] than

[1] Based on 1983 GNWT Bureau of Statistics statistics.

in Canada as a whole, the proportion of native inmates is not overly high considering the population is 58 percent native.

6.4.2 Fort Simpson and Inuvik South Areas

The administrative areas of Fort Simpson[1] and Inuvik South[2] experienced similar "highs" in admissions and average sentence lengths in 1982 and "lows" in 1983. There is an increasing trend shown in Fort Simpson Area's average sentence length but fluctuations in the other variables clouds the presence of any trend. Five year totals overcome this problem and suggest a general increase in the number of inmates.

The under 18 age group consists proportionally more of the admissions from Fort Simpson Area than for the NWT (except for the years 1981 to 1983). The proportion of admissions 24 years of age or less is approximately 10 percent greater in the Fort Simpson Area than the NWT as a whole. There was no admissions less than 18 years of age from Inuvik South Area for a majority of the years from 1967 to 1983. The two older age groups fluctuate in relative dominance; age group 18 to 24 predominates from 1980 onward.

The predominant offences of the Canadian Criminal Code in these area are "against the person" and "against property." Alcohol offences are under territorial ordinances are not recorded in this data set.

These age groups may warrant further analysis. Also age/sex

---

[1] Fort Simpson Area includes the communities of Fort Simpson, Nahanni Butte, Wrigley, Fort Liard, Trout Lake, Jean Marie River, Tungsten, Willowlake River, Fort Providence and Kakiska Lake.

[2] Inuvik South Area includes the communities of Fort Norman, Norman Wells, Fort Good Hope, Colville Lake and Fort Franklin.

Table 6.9

Number of Person's Receiving a Jail Sentence

	Correction Admissions	
	Fort Simpson Area	Inuvik South Area
1967	8	3
1968	15	5
1969	24	4
1970	27	3
1971	28	9
1967-71 Total	**102**	**24**
Average	**20**	**5**
1972	15	10
1973	68	4
1974	33	8
1975	28	10
1976	36	8
1972-76 Total	**180**	**40**
Average	**36**	**8**
1977	64	30
1978	43	36
1979	40	11
1980	36	40
1981	24	20
1977-81 Total	**207**	**137**
Average	**41**	**27**
1982	63	42
1983	12	10
1982-83 Total	**75**	**52**
Average	**38**	**26**

variable could be examined.

6.5 Summary and Conclusion

The number of admissions to territorial correction centers have steadily increased since the 1960's. The proportion of offenders (under 18 years of age) has risen faster than any other age group. This indicates the limitations and problems communities are facing.

Major limitations of the data forms discussed is presented in Table 6.10.

Table 6.10

Chief Limitations of the Data Discussed

Data Type	Chief Limitations
1. Sentenced intakes by age group, sentence length, supervising area and calendar year	- community breakdown lacking
2. Sentenced intakes by major offence grouping, sentence length, supervising area and calendar year	- community breakdown lacking - alcohol offences not differentiated from other territorial ordinances
3. Special report on territorial correction centers' inmate populations	- community and area breakdown lacking - only one year available
4. Special report on territorial correction centers' admissions and closures	- community and area breakdown lacking - only one year available
5. Special report on probation and parole by area, region and total NWT	- community data lacking - only a part of the corrections system - only one year available
6. Probation length study by community 1981-1983	- very short time span - only a part of the corrections system

7. SUICIDES

7.1 Contact Person

Kathy Pramsma

Medical Services Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Yellowknife, NWT
X1A 2R3

(403) 873-7041

7.2 Data Inventory and Evaluation

7.2.1 Number of suicides by ethnicity,[1] age group,[2] sex, method and year for the total NWT.

These data are available in the annual Report on Health Conditions in the Northwest Territories which is published for Medical Services Branch, Health and Welfare, Canada. These statistics are available since the early 1970's. The 1983 report should be published soon.

Evaluation. Cumulated data on suicides for the NWT provides an overview but does not indicate the condition of individual communities. In order to have a use as a social indicator, the data need to be available at smaller statistical units.

The number of suicides are hard to determine as the intentions of

---

[1] Indian, Inuit and other.

[2] The first grouping is less than 15, followed by 10 year ranges.

the deceased are often not known. Only verified cases are included in these statistics. The small number of annual cases suggests that a five or tangent set is necessary for any interpretation.

7.3 Assessment and Analysis

Suicide data for the NWT is presented in Table 7.1. The majority of those who commit suicide are young males. Almost 50 percent fall within the 15 to 24 year age group. Males committed over three-quarters of the suicides in the time period 1979 to 1982. There does not appear to be any particular directional trend in the data.

7.4 Northern Perspectives

According to Will Drake (Social Services, Fort Simpson), none of the 5 or 6 people who committed suicide in Fort Simpson in the winter of 1983/84 were involved with the Norman Wells construction activity. The suicides may be associated with the process of modernization which is forcing rapid changes to native values and attitudes.

7.5 Summary and Conclusion

There does not appear to be any particular trend in the number of suicides in the NWT. These data are not published at the community or area level probably because of the small number of occurrences.

Suicide rates may be an important measure of the degree of 'stress and strain' on native peoples, particularly young people who may

Table 7.1

Suicides in the Northwest Territories

	1977			1978			1979	
Age	Indian	Inuit	Other	Indian	Inuit	Other	Inuit	Other
0-15	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
15-24	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0
25-34	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	2
35-44	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	1
45-54	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Total	3	4	5	1	11	12	3	4
		12			24		7	

	1980		1981		1982		
Age	Inuit	Other	Inuit	Other	Inuit	Indian	Other
0-15	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
15-24	2	2	5	2	2	0	0
25-34	2	1	1	0	1	1	1
35-44	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
45-54	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	5	6	3	3	1	2
	9		9		6		

-- = data not available.

have lost a sense of direction and purpose in their lives. This loss may be associated with the pace of change (modernization) and/or with the uncertainty of a role for natives in the new order.

9. DIAND MONITORING REPORTS

Interim Report. R.M. Bone, September 1982.

Report 1-83. Norman Wells Project: 1983 Field Activities Report. Robert J. Mahnic and John W. Pomeroy, July 1983.

Report 2-83. Database and Survey Discussions Report. R.M. Bone, July 1983.

Report 3-83. Presentations at the Calgary Workshop: Monitoring the Socio-Economic Impacts of the Norman Wells Project and the Norman Wells Energy Project: A Problem of Monitoring. R.M. Bone, M.B. Green and R.J. Mahnic, August 1983.

Report 4-83. Norman Wells Project: Overview 1983. R.M. Bone, November 1983.

Report 1-84. The DIAND Socio-Economic Monitoring Program: Its Methodology and Data Verification. R.M. Bone, September 1984.

Report 2-84. Attitudes Towards the Norman Wells Project. Sheena Bates, September 1984.

Report 3-84. Analysis of Rankings of Socio-Economic Impacts of the Norman Wells Pipeline Project. M.B. Green and R.M. Bone, October 1984.

Report 4-84. Changes in the Size of the Native Labour Force from 1982 to 1983. Sheena Bates, November 1984.

Report 5-84. The Norman Wells Energy Report: Establishment of Socio-Economic Conditions. M.B. Green and R.M. Bone, March 1984.

Report 6-84. Assessment of Selected Statistical Data from the GNWT. Debra Brown, November 1984.

Report 7-84. Analysis of the Business Sectors of Norman Wells, Fort Norman, Wrigley and Fort Simpson, 1982 to 1983. P.T. Bates, November 1984.

Report 8-84. Impact of the Norman Wells Project on the Economic Base of Norman Wells, Fort Norman, Wrigley and Fort Simpson, 1982 to 1983. P.T. Bates, November 1984.

Report 9-84. DIAND Norman Wells Socio-Economic Monitoring Program: A Three-Year Review. Robert M. Bone, December 1984.

Report 10-84. DIAND Norman Wells Socio-Economic Monitoring Program: Publications Program. S.M. Meldrum, November, 1984.

Copies of these reports can be obtained by contacting Norman Wells Project, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Les Terrasses de la Chaudiére, Ottawa, K1A 0H4.